

*J. Murphy*

VOLUME XIII.

[SEPTEMBER.]

NUMBER 4.

THE  
**RELIGIOUS MONITOR,**

AND

**EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:**

**DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,**

AS SET FORTH IN THE

**Formularies of the Westminster Divines,**

AND WITNESSED FOR BY THE

**ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.**

REV. JAMES MARTIN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. Jer. vi. 16.

ALBANY:

PRINTED BY HOFFMAN AND WHITE.

.....  
1836-7.



THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1836.

---

ART. I.—*Review of an Account of the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, and of the principles of the Seceders, contained in the first and second numbers of the Biblical Repertory, for 1835.*

(Continued from page 115.)

REMARKS ON THE JUDICIAL TESTIMONY.

About 16 or 17 pages of the second article of the Repertory are occupied with an analysis of the Judicial Testimony, enacted in 1736, by the first four Seceders. As it would be impossible to do justice to this publication by any abridgment which would not by its length trespass on the patience of the reader; and as in the Repertory a judgment of its contents is seldom expressed, we shall only make a few brief remarks.

The editors of the Repertory appear carefully to quote from this Testimony every thing said against unlimited toleration. It will be no more than justice to the first Seceders to say, that they were not by any means in the hindmost rank of the advocates of civil and religious liberty. The very expressions, which they use show that they were advocates of toleration, but not of "boundless toleration." The civil and ecclesiastical governments of Britain were so blended together that the enemies of the one must of necessity be the enemies of the other. The civil government had established the Protestant religion in opposition to Popery, and after what the Presbyterians had suffered from Popery, it is not at all strange to find them regarding it as an enemy both to their civil and religious liberties, and that they were exceedingly jealous of any toleration granted by the State which might restore the Papists to power. The opinion of the Seceders on this subject was not peculiar to them, nor are we prepared to say that it was either unchristian or unreasonable. Those who wish well to the liberty of their country, would do well to guard themselves against those whose principles bind them to determined hostility against every free govern-

ment, and bring them under slavish subjection to the most despotic power on earth. If it be reasonable to refuse the fellowship of citizens to those who still retain allegiance to other foreign powers, there can be no good reason to make an exception in favor of the subjects of the Pope. When Britain was brought under the yoke of Oliver Cromwell, it is said in this Testimony, that a most sinful toleration of sectarian errors and delusions was granted by Cromwell. But observe, from the effects attributed to it, what kind of toleration was intended. "This was the first of *this kind* known among us since the Reformation; and thereby such laxness in principle and practice, was introduced as paved a way for the more general apostacy and defection which followed very soon thereafter. The aforesaid toleration was faithfully witnessed against by some ministers in the provinces of Perth and Fife, in their Testimony, published anno 1659, as contrary to the word of God, our Confession of Faith, and Larger Catechism; and as contrary to, and inconsistent with the solemn oath and covenant of God, sworn by the nation; and likewise, as producing many dismal and sinful effects, such as the increase and growth of errors and blasphemy, with laxness and profaneness in practice; and also as a temptation to men to break the Lord's bonds asunder, and to cast his cords from them." (*Testimony of 1737, p. 27.*) What is referred to will be evident from the history of Cromwell's proceedings. When he invaded Scotland he prohibited the meeting of the General Assemblies, limited the power of the Church in discipline, encouraged those who were enemies to the Presbyterian form of government, and forbade the taking of oaths or covenants without the direction of the court. He was followed by an army most of whom were Independents and Anabaptists. These, as bishop Burnet says, were all gifted, and preached as they were moved. He mentions that once, when he was present, they came into a public assembly of the Church, and reproached the preachers for laying things to their charge which were false. The debate grew fierce, and they at last drew their swords. This was the kind of toleration with which the Presbyterians of that day were exceedingly dissatisfied, and which the Seceders notice with disapprobation in their Testimony.

At the accession of James II. the toleration granted was still more exceptionable. It proceeded from the supreme authority of the king in ecclesiastical matters, it tended to establish the Popish on the ruin of the Protestant religion; and laid a foundation for persecuting the Presbyterians by the condition on which they were to be allowed their liberty, which was that "they were not to teach what might any wise tend to alienate the heart of the people from the king or his government." When it is considered that the king was a Papist, it is easy to see that this condition implied that nothing was to be said against Popery. Others besides the Seceders have thought the thanks given on this occasion to King James by the ministers of Edinburgh, were both unseasonable and sinful.

The situation of things in our own country may render it proper to notice another censure, which the Seceders passed in this Testimony upon the General Assembly of 1690, the first which met after the Revolution, as the accession of the Prince of Orange to the throne has been usually called. The index of the unprinted acts of the Assembly, 1690, says this Testimony, bears a public declaration by the Moderator, "That the Assembly would depose no incumbents simply for their judgment concerning the government of the church." That is, they



declare that the perfidious prelates (meaning those who had abjured Presbyterianism for pelacy,) and their underlings were not to be deposed for their treacherous defection from the covenanted principles of this church. And in consistency with this declaration the Assembly 1694, enjoin their Commission (as several Assemblies afterwards did,) "To receive into ministerial communion such of the late conform ministers, as, having qualified themselves according to law, shall subscribe the formula." (*Testimony* p. 53.) It seems evident that this reception of those who were prelaticists in principle, and Presbyterians from convenience or interest, laid the foundation for that corruption and tyranny which issued in the Secession. That a corresponding liberality in admitting among Presbyterians in the United States those who are Independents in principle and Presbyterians only in name, has introduced corruption and contempt for church authority is generally known and confessed. Whether these things will increase till they work a similar issue is yet to be seen.

The editors of the Repertory give a large extract from this Testimony respecting the errors of Professor Simpson, and the proceedings of the Assembly in his case. They also testify their approbation of the views of the Seceders respecting the sinful lenity of the Assembly towards him. Why have they not also given us their opinion about the proceedings in the case of Professor Campbell, whose errors are scarcely less opposite to the true gospel than Mr. Simpson's? The only judgment they give us is in substance, that this is the most tedious part of this tedious Testimony. In the enumeration of his errors, they have omitted one of the most important, as it appears to be completely subversive of the true doctrine of justification. The fourth error with which he was charged was, "That we are to settle it as our main purpose to recommend ourselves to the love, esteem and commendation of God, and of all mankind, by our moral virtue." And in the account of the Testimony given by the Seceders against the proceedings in his case, after stating that they censured the Assembly for overlooking, or too slightly censuring some of his errors, it should have been added, and for adopting others. Mr. Campbell gave explanations of his doctrine, which was not a novel thing with heretics even in that day, and the Assembly agreed to some of his explanations, in which he advanced the same errors before taught, only in a more covert manner. It may be some apology for the particular notice taken of his errors, that it was at the time when the brethren were preparing their Testimony, that his case had been before the church courts; he was also occupying a conspicuous station as a Theological Professor; his errors were of the most important kind, overthrowing at the same time the foundations both of doctrinal and practical religion; and from this case the general state of the Church might be ascertained, so that the Seceders appear to have regarded a pointed Testimony against his errors as peculiarly seasonable and important. It is not uncommon that some one through superior talent or fortuitous circumstances, is placed at the head of systems of error. But it is unjust to regard all the opposition made to the system of error under the name of such a prominent individual as opposition to that man. If Arius, Pelagius, Socinus, and others, had been quite alone in their belief, it is probable that we should never have heard of their names. It is evident from the accounts given us of the preachers in the time of Mr. Campbell that his system of doctrine was as to the leading features of it, exceedingly fashionable. The description

of the moderates, given in Dr. Witherspoon's characteristics, agrees with the account of the same persons contained in this Testimony, and from both it is evident that there was a Campbellism in that day as well as in this, and that it was the prevailing and fashionable religion. So that there is no reason to suppose that the whole force of the Judicial Testimony on this subject was directed against this one man.

The Repertory thinks the Seceders, had no reason to find fault with the Assembly for refusing to enter on a trial of Professor Simpson, and directing Mr. Webster, who had brought up his case on *public fame*, to bring charges against him before the Presbytery to which he belonged. This course, they say, was evidently proper. If so, it seems as if the worst heretic ought to pass unnoticed, until some one will consent to become his prosecutor. What if Mr. Webster had declined a task usually regarded as odious? Then, Mr. Simpson might have gone on to propagate his errors with impunity. It is a homely but a sound maxim, that "what is every body's business is nobody's business." When there is a report of error taught in the church, the whole church is concerned in taking notice of it, and employing measures to purge out this leaven, whether any one will become a prosecutor or not.

The testimony of the Seceders, it is noticed, complains of the repeal of the penal statutes against witches. What things were reckoned as among the crimes of witches and charmers, may be ascertained from the chapter on this subject in Stewart's collections—He notices as among the things relevant to infer the crime of witchcraft—Paction to serve the devil; the use of magic arts or charms, though for good ends, as for the curing of diseases in men or cattle. Consulting with such persons is declared to be censurable, also professing necromancy, and getting responses by the sieve, the shear, and the book, and all such cheats and species of sorcery. Under the same chapter, fortune-tellers are described and declared punishable arbitrarily, not capitally. Mr. Gib, says, in a note on this part of the testimony, that "The Associate Presbytery is not to be considered as having ever interested themselves in the affair of these *penal statutes*.—What they saw cause to testify against, as among the public sins of the nation, is,—an *absolute repealing* of these statutes; That there shall be no prosecution against any person for witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment or conjuration."

#### THE DECLINATURE.

The Judicial Testimony as has been stated, was published in 1737. The next Assembly which met, May, 1738, passed a long act respecting the Seceders. The Repertory says, "They chose still to treat them in the spirit of meekness, brotherly love and forbearance." How much foundation there is for this assertion of the editors, may be learned from their own account of the act, from which it appears that the Assembly declared the Seceders guilty of "schismatic conduct," by which they "had laid themselves liable to be again cut off from the church." "Synods and Presbyteries were required to make reports of their proceedings to the next Commission; and this court was authorized and empowered, if they should judge it expedient, to cite the separating brethren before the next General Assembly, to answer for their irregular conduct; and it was enjoined on all to exert themselves to prevent the increase of the schism, which threatened to disturb the peace of the church, and which was so contrary to the spirit of the gospel;

and to endeavor to reclaim the poor deluded people who had been seduced to take part in this division." The "meekness, brotherly love and forbearance" of such measures, are sufficiently evident without any comment.

It has been questioned by some, whether there is any proper call to exercise discipline towards those who voluntarily decline the communion of the church, or the authority of her judicatories, and who may on this account be regarded as excommunicated by their own act. But whatever may be thought of the proper course towards such, there is not much reason to suppose that the General Assembly were moved to take the measures, adopted against the Seceders by a conscience of duty and a spirit of faithfulness to Christ. Their proceedings do not look like measures originating in a concern for the truth, and the best interests of the Lord's cause, but rather like measures of resentment against those who had honestly exposed their defections. The contrast between the papers published by the different parties is striking, and no person of a spiritual mind can fail to observe it. The acts of the Assembly are in the "high tone of church authority" as even the enemies of the Seceders are obliged to own. They never show a disposition to confess any guilt, or examine into the defections alledged against them. They never attempted to answer the reasonings of the Seceders, or use any measures to satisfy their minds except arbitrary acts. Where they had made the most manifest and greivous defections, they ever show the greatest bitterness against the testimony by which these were exposed. On the other hand the Seceders write as men not particularly concerned in their own cause, but in the cause of the Lord. They neither use railing or bitter language, but after all that is said to the contrary, considering the provocations which they had received, the spirit of meekness appearing in their papers is remarkable, and worthy of high commendation. When they have occasion to speak of the defections of the church, they do it plainly, yet neither with bitterness nor pride, but with sorrow and humiliation. If it were not for the length and number of these papers and the frequent though necessary repetitions of the same things, there could be no better defence of the secession than to publish all the papers of the Assembly, and of the Seceders, side by side, and let them speak for themselves. No child of God could be long at a loss to find with which party, was most of the spirit of Christ. He would soon discover on the one side a spirit not very remote from that of the men who had in former ages shed the blood of the saints, and on the other, a spirit but little inferior to that which appeared in the fathers of the Erskines and others of the Seceders who had suffered during the late fiery persecutions.

Agreeably to the act of Assembly, the Commission at their meeting in November of the same year, gathered out of the reports, of Synods and Presbyteries, materials for a libel against the Seceders, and appointed a committee of their number to put the same in order and form, against their next meeting in March, at which time the draught of the said libel was approved, and appointed to be put into their hands, with a citation to appear before the Assembly, May, 1739. This proceeding was regarded by these brethren as a call in Providence, in addition to former calls of the same nature, to declare their mind more particularly in relation to the Judicatories of the established Church. This they did in a Declinature, adopted May 16th, 1739, and read the next day to the Assembly, as their answer to the above mentioned libel.

This paper is entitled, "Act of the Associate Presbytery, finding and declaring, that the present Judicatories of this national Church are not lawful, and rightly constituted courts of Christ, and declining all authority, power and jurisdiction that the said Judicatories may claim to themselves over the said Presbytery, or any of the members thereof, or over any that are under their inspection; and particularly declining the authority of a General Assembly now met at Edinburgh, the 10th day of May, 1739."

In this act, after stating that church courts lawfully constituted, are the ordinances of Christ, appointed for gracious ends, they proceed to show that the Judicatories of the established Church of Scotland, were so perverted from these ends, that it was warrantable to decline their authority. "It is with regret," say they, "that this Presbytery find themselves obliged in duty to take this step. It would be matter of great satisfaction to them, that they had not these grounds and reasons, which are of such weight and importance with them, as to oblige them to testify and declare in the above manner." To this measure they regard themselves as obliged in consequence of the libel put into their hands. "And they humbly and earnestly intreat all ministers, elders and others who desire to be found faithful unto the Lord in this day of perplexity and treading down, seriously to consider the following grounds and reasons of their present act, declaration, and declinature, and to weigh them, without any partial bias, in the balances of the sanctuary."

1. Their first reason for declaring the judicatories not lawful and rightly constituted courts of Christ, was their receiving into their number and supporting intruders. As the subjects of a king were warranted to refuse the jurisdiction of those who had not the king's authority, so they judged themselves warranted to decline the jurisdiction of a court partly composed of intruders who could have no authority from Christ as judges in his house, and partly of those who supported these men, and associated with them in judgment. The judicatories were also constituted of many members guilty of scandalous practices, shepherds who scattered the sheep of the Lord's pasture, who ruled them with force and cruelty, lived disorderly, and yet were not censured.

2. Their second reason for the above act, was the toleration of the erroneous, and the enaction of laws contrary to the laws of the King of Zion, by which ministerial freedom was restrained, and the heritage of God oppressed and broken. In addition to the cases of Messrs. Simpson and Campbell, formerly noticed, they mention the recent case of Dr. Wishart, accused of errors, and acquitted without any particular examination of his doctrines, simply on the ground of his professing an adherence to the confession of Faith.

3. A third reason is partly taken from some recent proceedings in the case of Captain Porteus. This man who is acknowledged to have been of a profligate character, in attending upon a public execution at Edinburgh, having received some provocation, fired, and caused his men to fire upon the promiscuous multitude, by which means a considerable number of persons were killed, and several others wounded. He was in consequence of this convicted of murder and condemned to death, but being a favorite with some men of influence, he obtained a reprieve. Such, however, was the general indignation against him, that one of the most orderly mobs which perhaps ever assembled together, collected on the evening of the 7th of Sept., 1736, and having broken open the prison, carried him out and executed him in the Grass-Market. At the next



meeting of Parliament an act was passed by which all persons charged with being accessory to the murder of Captain Porteus, were commanded on pain of death, to surrender themselves for trial within a limited time; all persons concealing or succoring them after that time, were adjudged to incur the pains of death; and persons were encouraged to become witnesses against their accomplices by the promise of pardon, and of a great reward, yet all the authority and promises of the government availed nothing. No discovery was made of a single individual engaged in this mysterious transaction. It was required that the act above referred to, should be read in the time of public worship, on the first Sabbath of every month for a year, by every minister of the Church of Scotland. This appears to have been intended as a measure of revenge, against the stricter ministers by whom, it is probable, the king and parliament suspected the mob to have been instigated. And it was farther enacted, that if "any minister shall neglect to read this act, as is hereby directed, he shall for the first offence be declared incapable of sitting or voting in any church judicatory; and for the second offence, be declared incapable of taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefice in Scotland." It was also ordained that these *ecclesiastical penalties*, should be executed by the court of Session, or any court of Justiciary, upon a summary complaint, at the instance of his Majesty's Advocate. Most of the ministers of the Established Church read the above act in whole, or in part, though various measures were employed to elude the indignation of the people against them for doing it.

In the Declinature, this is noticed as a subjection of the church to the civil powers in spiritual matters. The reading of the act being purely of a civil nature, was no part of the worship of God, and, therefore, a manifest violation of the Sabbath, and a prostitution of the ministry to secular purposes. It's being enjoined by the civil powers, and yet submitted to by the ministers, exposed them to the contempt of the people; and one of the penalties being suspension from the ministry, submission to it, was a consent to the power of the magistrate over the church in things purely spiritual. Yet the Assembly neither censured those who had submitted to this act, nor did any thing to assert her right in opposition to these encroachments of the civil power. This, together with various things of the same character, were considered by the Seceders as sufficient ground for charging the judicatories with having allowed themselves to become "subordinate to the civil powers in their ecclesiastical meetings, functions, and administrations, and, therefore," say they, "this Presbytery cannot own them as free and lawful courts of Christ." This affair of Captain Porteus, says the Repertory, "was made a handle of by the Seceders in their act and testimony." It is a little strange, not that they found this in the act and testimony, where it never happened to have a place, but that they should have ventured to reprobate the course of the Seceders in reference to this act. They had surely forgotten where they were, and what was the genius of this government, else they would hardly have expected success in this attempt to cast odium upon the Seceders. What free citizen of the United States is prepared to condemn these men, for standing up in defence of the rights of the church, against the slavish submission of the ministers of the establishment? Or who can respect those ministers who showed themselves willing to do what their consciences could not approve, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the government, and losing their votes and their benefices? If in the United States such an

act were passed by the civil authorities, requiring every minister in the country, on the pain of losing his office and worldly support, to read a paper, the reading of which, all serious people would regard as a profanation of the Sabbath, a prostitution of the ministry, and a consent to the magistrate's power in religious things over the church, we hope the Editors of the Repertory, as well as the Seceders, would make a handle of it; and that they would handle any who would tamely submit to such tyranny, in a way not much to their credit.

The Seceders having stated the above reasons for declining the judicatories of the church, go on to say, "It is matter of grief and concern to them, that matters are come to this pass between the said judicatories and them. Their consciences bear them witness that they desire unity and harmony in the Church; but the unity which they ought to desire, is the unity of the Spirit, even unity in the Lord; it is such a unity as may make for the glory of God, for the honor of truth, and for the real edification of the body of Christ. And therefore, they do with all sincerity, beseech the present judicatories of the church, to return to the Lord, from whom we have, every one of us, deeply revolted, and to acknowledge and mourn over the sins of our fathers, and the defections of the judicatories, ministers and people of the present age and generation; and to use proper means for the conviction and humiliation of such as have been intruded into the ministry, or who have been active in carrying on the course of defection: As also they intreat them to display the banner of a judicial testimony, in asserting the crown-rights of the Redeemer, and condemning the encroachments which have been made upon His crown and kingdom of late, and in former times; and to assert judicially, the truths of God, that have been of late assaulted and opposed; and to condemn expressly, the errors which have been vented, to the subverting and corrupting of the truths of God, and to the poisoning of the youth who are trained up for the holy ministry. If these and the like duties were sincerely attempted, then might this Presbytery hope for a beautiful unity and a desirable harmony with the present judicatories. But they are afraid that these their sincere and hearty desires shall be despised and condemned by the said judicatories: and therefore, they judge it their duty, with all humility, tenderness and earnestness, in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ, to intreat and beseech their reverend, worthy and dear Brethren, both ministers and elders, who regard the covenanted testimony of the Church of Scotland, and who desire to be found faithful to the Lord, that for the love they bear to the honor and glory of the Redeemer, and his despised truths, and for the sake of the weary, broken and scattered heritage of God through the land, as also, that they may be in a capacity to transmit a faithful testimony to succeeding generations, to come out from the present judicatories, and from all ministerial communion with them, as they would not be partakers in their sins, in regard they are constituted, as said is, of such corrupt and scandalous members, and are in their judicial capacity, carrying on a course of defection and backsliding. And for the other reasons and grounds above mentioned, they also do, in the same manner, intreat and beseech their said worthy and dear brethren, that they would make use of the keys of government and discipline, committed unto them by the Head of the church, for the end and purposes for which they are given them; that they would put to their hand to lift up the standard of a judicial testimony for the borne-down truths

of God, and for purging and planting the house of God in Scotland, according to the word of God, and our Reformation-principles agreeable thereto, and after the example of our worthy progenitors in the year 1638; believing that the set time for favoring Zion, even the time that the Lord hath set, will come. As for this Presbytery, whatever the conduct of the judicatories towards them may be, and however they may be borne down, reproached and despised, they are persuaded that the cause is the Lord's; and, however weak and unworthy they are whom He hath singled out in his adorable Providence, to put hand to a testimony for him, and whatever He may see meet to do with them, they desire to rest in faith and hope, that the Lord will build up his Jerusalem in Scotland, and gather his dispersed Israel into one." [*Acts and proceedings of the Associate Presbytery, pp. 23-25.*]

On the next day after passing this act, the Presbytery met and continued in their constituted capacity, till they were informed that the Assembly were calling their names by their officer. After a brother had engaged in prayer for the Lord's presence and countenance in this weighty affair, they went as a Presbytery into the Assembly-house, when the moderator of the Assembly told them, that though they were called to answer to a libel, yet he was warranted in the name of this Assembly to acquaint them, that, notwithstanding of all that was past, the Assembly were willing to receive them with open arms, if they would return into the bosom of the church. Mr. Thomas Mair made answer, as moderator of the Presbytery, stating that they had appeared before the Assembly in their Presbyterial capacity, and offered to read the above mentioned act of declinature. But the Assembly first ordered their libel to be read, after which "Mair," as the Repertory says, "was permitted to read the Presbytery's 'Act and Declinature,' and then delivered it into the hands of the moderator of the Assembly."

THE LIBEL FORMED AGAINST THE SECEDERS; THEIR REMARKS UPON THIS LIBEL, AND UPON THE SENTENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY AGAINST THEM.

This libel is framed against Messrs. Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alex'r Moncrieff, James Fisher, Ralph Erskine, Thomas Mair, Thomas Nairn, and James Thompson, the two last of whom had lately acceded to the Associate Presbytery. The Repertory says, it is "written with peculiar force and solemnity." The amount of it is, that these brethren had seceded, had published a testimony, and proceeded to judicial acts by licensing young men to preach, and exercising discipline.

The remarks which the Presbytery made upon this document appear to us to be much more forcible and solemn than the libel itself. However, this may be owing to the same kind of taste which keeps us from relishing the energy and sublimity of the seraphic Watts, in the judgment of some so far superior to the sweet psalmist of Israel. Something of the character of the libel and the merits of the cause at issue will appear from a brief sketch of these remarks of the Presbytery.

The libel, in the preamble, virtually charges these ministers with not acting agreeably to their ordination vows, in which they had promised submission to the government of the church, and engaged to follow no divisive course. The brethren answer, that not they, but the judicatories were violating these ordination engagements, by pursuing mea-

tures contrary to that Presbyterian form of government which they were all equally bound to maintain. They inquire why the libellers make no mention of the Confession of Faith, by which the Seceders always wished to be tried, and the doctrine of which the judicatories refused to assert and maintain, in opposition to prevailing errors. The preamble charges them with offences contrary to those texts of scripture requiring love and charity, peace and unity; but as the brethren say in their answer, neither a particular text nor a particular offence is specified, and they omit *the truth* which the scriptures require with love, peace and unity, as the foundation of them. And the principal ground for making this charge, was their having witnessed against defections, which they regarded themselves as obliged to do by the law of love; Lev. xix. 17.

After this general charge, a number of particular offences are mentioned in the libel, and first of all, "That the said ministers had seceded from this church without any justifiable grounds," &c. In answer to this it is said, that the secession was not from the communion of the church, but from the judicatories, and that this had been made necessary by the judicatories themselves. The reasons of this step they had stated to the world, but no attempt had been made to answer these reasons, and satisfy their minds that they had no just grounds of secession. Mere assertion, and church authority were the only measures employed to convince them of an error.

The second article of libel was, "That the seceding ministers had assumed a power of associating and erecting themselves into a Presbytery," &c. They answer, that they had a warrant from the word of God to do so, and they had given their reasons for this in the preface to their Testimony, to which they refer.

The third article of libel is their framing and publishing a testimony, in which they cast many groundless and calumnious reflections upon the church. In answer to this, they observe, that the Assembly has passed a general condemnation upon this testimony without specifying a single particular in which it has departed from the word of God, or the laudable acts and constitutions of the church; a thing which they are persuaded the Assembly could not do. They also notice this, as a sad evidence of a spirit of defection, when those who were reprov'd pronounced themselves innocent, and prosecuted such as dealt plainly and faithfully with them. Jer. ii. 35. xviii. 18.

The fourth article of the libel, consists of charges of dispensing ordinances to persons of other congregations, ordaining elders in some of these congregations, appointing and keeping fasts in different corners of the country, by which means their proper ministerial work in their own parishes was neglected. To this the brethren answer, in substance, that they regarded themselves as obliged to attend to such parts of the oppressed heritage of God as had acceded to them. The insinuation, that in so doing, they neglected their particular flocks, they assert to be a "barefaced calumny." They were willing to have their diligence in their own parishes compared with that of their present accusers.

The fifth article of libel is, their "actually licensing one or more to preach the gospel." They reply by owning that they had, as charged, licensed Mr. John Hunter, and that they judged it their duty, not only to license, but to ordain, "whenever Providence should open a door for it, particularly among the scattered, and broken heritage of God, who



are groaning under the weight of intruded hirelings, and can find no help and relief from the present judicatories." The relief of such was one main end of their Presbyterial Association.

The sixth article of libel, coincides with the first, accusing them of secession, only the secession of the first four ministers, is dated from June, 1734, instead of November, 1733, when the Commission thrust them out from communion. To this singular inconsistency, the Assembly were driven by their own inconsistent, vacillating course. They could not charge the Seceders with what was in reality the act of the Commission which cast them out of the church, nor could they bring up again, what by their own act, had been buried in oblivion when the sentence against the four brethren was repealed, and therefore, in order to revive a prosecution which could not be legally done, they change the date of the offence, and charge these men with seceding from the church, at a time when they had no connexion with it. If the error of the date be corrected, then the case will be simply thus. These four men were first punished, and when it was found that this would not subdue their spirit of religious independence, they were pardoned, and when this show of clemency did not subdue them, they are devoted to punishment a second time. And the great ground of offence was, that they had consented to the punishment inflicted; when they were cast out of the church, they went out, and because they went out, they must be taken up and cast out again. Such is the true character of this *libel*, written with such "peculiar force and solemnity."

Several other articles follow, which relate to the exercise of discipline, such as absolving some, and excommunicating others. And the whole is concluded, with a particular charge against Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, on account of a warning or protestation, read by him from the pulpit of Stirling, against five elders who had, with the concurrence of the magistrates, usurped the place of twelve others in collecting for the poor. In their remarks, the Seceders answer all these charges particularly, and give a full narration of the case of these five elders, with a copy of Mr. Erskine's protestation, and a defence of it. [*Acts and proceedings of the Associate Presbytery*, pp. 44-52.]

The Declinature of the Seceders was read in the Assembly, May 17th. On the 19th, the Assembly past an act, declaring the above-mentioned libel relevant to infer deposition, and proven in its most material articles by the declinature, by which paper they say, they find that "the said defenders have had the unparalleled boldness to appear before the highest judicatory of this church, to which they had vowed obedience, and instead of answering for themselves as pannels or defenders at the bar, pretended to appear as a separate, independent, and constituted judicatory, and to read or pronounce an act of theirs condemning the church, and the judicatories thereof upon several groundless pretences, and to decline the authority of the same; and that they have farther, in presence of the Assembly, by the said paper, taken upon them to speak in most injurious, disrespectful and insolent terms, concerning the highest civil authority: Therefore the General Assembly do find and declare, that the said defenders for the offences so found relevant and proven, do justly merit the highest censures of this church, and particularly that of deposition, &c."

The Assembly, however, agreed to delay their final sentence, for a year, urging it however, in the strongest terms, upon the next Assem-

bly to inflict the censure of deposition, if the defenders persisted in their "unwarrantable separation."

In their remarks upon this sentence, the Seceders take notice of the heavy charges brought against them of "unwarrantable and schismatical practices," and of doing what "in them lies to ruin and destroy the interest of religion in this church." They complain that they are condemned in a general and summary way, on the ground of their declinature, while not one article of it is found to be contrary to the word of God, or the standards of the church. They complain that the steps of defection pointed out in the declinature, are declared to be nothing but "groundless pretences." They also complain, that in the spirit of the persecutors of the church, an attempt is made to excite the civil authorities against them, by representing them as speaking "in the most injurious, insolent and disrespectful terms of the highest civil authority." The only foundation for this charge, was their testimony against the power exercised over the church by the civil authorities in the case of captain Porteus. And by this act, the Assembly approves of such exercise of civil authority in the affairs of the church, so as to pronounce a testimony against it, injurious, disrespectful, insolent, and a crime meriting deposition. They conclude, upon the whole, that the judicatories manifest no disposition to remove the grounds of their secession, and that the Associate Presbytery, have good ground and reason to judge it more and more warrantable and necessary for them to continue to testify in the way of Secession. [*Acts and proceedings*, pp. 52-60.]

In 1740, the General Assembly, agreeably to the act of the preceding year, passed the sentence of deposition on the eight ministers mentioned in the libel, and declared their churches vacant. Thus the bonds between them and the Establishment were at last completely sundered, and no farther attempts were made on either side to effect a re-union.

#### THE EFFECTS OF THE SECESSION.

It is difficult to calculate with any precision, what effects would have been produced, on the supposition of a different state of things from that which has actually taken place; yet it is at least very reasonable to suppose, that the yielding of the Seceders to the tyrannical authority of the church, would have been a death blow to religious freedom in Scotland. If the bravest sons of the church had bowed beneath the yoke, it would have discouraged others from resisting, and it would have encouraged their oppressors to proceed farther, and make the yoke heavier. The cause of civil liberty is also in all cases, and especially where civil and religious things are so much blended as in Britain, intimately connected with the freedom of the church. And it will not be any more extravagant, to suppose the cause of civil liberty indebted to the resistance of the high handed measures of the church by the Seceders, than to suppose it indebted to a similar resistance by the first Reformers. The previous history of Britain, as well as the history of other nations, shows that if ever a slight usurpation of power be permitted at the first, it often encourages men to go to the utmost in tyranny and persecution. If it be wise to pray that we may not enter into temptation, it is equally wise to defend ourselves from the beginnings of civil and ecclesiastical bondage.

There can be no doubt that the Secession from the Established

Church proved a very seasonable check to the abuse of church authority, and to measures which evidently tended to bring the people once more, either under the bondage of prelacy, or a presbyterian bondage, equally intolerable. And wherever the church aims at the exercise of a lordly dominion over men, she always resorts to the same means; she unites with the civil power, and subjects herself to its authority, that she may be able to rule. This we see the Established Church of Scotland doing at this very time; while she was enslaving her members to her own power, she was also enslaving herself to the King and Parliament. The Secession, however, though small in its beginnings, changed materially the state of things. There was now a refuge for the oppressed, and it became evident, that extreme measures would drive the people so generally into the Secession, that the Establishment would be endangered. Now it was, that the men who could be moved by no argument, and restrained by no shame, were affected by fear, and began to sooth and court the people, whom before they had treated with contempt, and trampled under their feet. Now, they began to speak of peace and unity and charity, and to pity "the poor deluded people." Sir H. Moncrieff testifies by numerous facts, to the good effect of the Secession, in bringing the Assembly to more moderation and care in their measures, and to pay more deference to public opinion, while at the same time, he admits that this was in the spirit of accommodation to the times, and not from any change of system or principle. He says of the Assembly of 1736, "They discover more solicitude to deal tenderly with the people, and not to irritate their humours by unnecessary exertions of authority." He says again, speaking of the subsequent Assemblies, that they "evidently showed an inclination to conciliate the people," in respect to settlements; in some instances in direct terms, setting aside the presentees, to whom the opposition was most violent. He mentions the case of Mr. Mercer, in which the decision is said to be very unlike the proceedings of Assemblies since 1730. This Mr. Mercer, was the person who first moved a censure on Mr. Erskine's sermon, on which account, says Sir H. M., "he was in the highest degree, obnoxious to every order of people." [*Appendix, pp. 449-450.*] If we were only to look at these isolated cases, we might be tempted to think that there was quite a revolution in the church. It is, however, evident, that these decisions in favor of the people, were constrained by the fear of losing them, and where there were no fears that the "poor deluded people" might be seduced to take part with the Seceders, the church courts pursued the same measures as before.

The Repertory, after Sir H. Moncrieff, attributes the rapid increase of the Seceders to their popularity, their perpetual appeals to the people, and especially to their seizing upon every subject of popular discontent on account of the decisions of the Assembly, and finding a sphere of activity wherever there was an unsuccessful resistance to the induction of an obnoxious presentee. If the Seceders received into their communion, those who acceded to their profession, and granted to them the dispensation of gospel ordinances, they are not alone in so doing. Would other societies refuse people under such circumstances, lest they should be accused of finding "a new sphere of activity," "and the prospect of a new congregation to be added to their sect." They had testified against the defections of the church, while they were in it, at the hazzard of being cast out and deposed, and when

they had suffered themselves to be cast out, rather than be restrained from what they believed to be their duty, were they to be condemned because they did not give up that liberty for which all this had been endured? May Sir H. M. and the Repertory find fault with the Seceders, and yet must the Seceders be condemned, if they point out what they believe to be the failings or defections of others? But it is said, as if to set forth the unfair measures used by them to increase their party, that "they did not confine themselves to their original grounds of complaint against the Establishment, arising out of the act of 1732." What if they did not? If we find more sin in ourselves or others than we once saw, must we, notwithstanding, confine ourselves to our original confessions and complaints? It is evident, that as the attention of the Seceders was more particularly drawn to the history and principles of the church, their views of her defections were enlarged; but they had never confined themselves to the act of 1732, as their only ground of complaint. Mr. Erskine did not do this in his sermon, but expressly spoke, and was charged with speaking, against other unrighteous acts of the judicatories, and against many corruptions prevailing in the church. The act of Secession, also enumerates some things particularly, and mentions "many other weighty reasons" of secession, in general terms. After all that is said to the disparagement of the zeal and faithfulness of these men, we are persuaded that their success was owing to the divine power attending their ministry, and not to the low arts of which they are so frequently accused. Sir H. Moncrieff, himself, is much more candid in some parts of his book, than in those selected by the Repertory. He attributes the increase of the Secession more to the oppressive measures of the Assembly, than to the zeal, the labors, or the low cunning of the Seceders. In giving an account of the measures pursued by the Assembly, in respect to intruders, he states, that when ministers who were not acceptable to the people were presented, the congregations usually continued for a time to oppose them, and carried the matter from Presbyteries to Synods, and from Synods to General Assemblies. But, though artful measures were employed to soothe the people, yet the affair was always so managed that the settlement was effected. The compromise was always in favor of church authority. The consequence was, that the people desisted from any attempts to get redress from church courts, and whenever a minister was intruded upon them against their will, they went to work quietly to build a Seceding meeting-house. The increase of the Secession was not, therefore, according to this author, owing to low arts used by the Seceders to allure men into their communion, but to the oppressive acts of the Establishment. The people were driven out of the national church, and obliged to seek the bread of life elsewhere, unless they were content to sit down under the ministry of men whose entrance by force afforded much more evidence of their being wolves and hirelings, than true and faithful shepherds. All societies consider themselves at liberty to teach and propagate what they believe to be truth, and to receive into their communion such as agree with them in their principles. The Presbyterian "Sect" in the United States, the Established Sect of Scotland, and all others, regard themselves at liberty in these things, as much as the "Sect" of the Seceders. And if we must be a *Sect* because we happen not to be so numerous as some others, there would be the more excuse for diligence to increase in number, that we might rise above the reach of that ill name. Yet if Sec-



tarianism consist in zeal and efforts to increase numbers more than to promote principles, the Secession church has not, hitherto, rendered herself remarkable for such a spirit. She has not shown a disposition to gather in from all sources, people of all kinds, that she might strengthen her party, but has been generally reproached for regarding principle too much, and refusing on all hands, such as agree not to her profession. Had she respected party more, and principle less, she might have occupied a higher place in the esteem of those who measure the worth of churches by number, much in the same way that the world measures the worth of men, by money.

Another measure which the Seceders are represented as having employed to increase their number is stated in these words, "They at the same time devised expedients and restrictions, by which for many years, they excluded their adherents from all communication with the established churches; and in this way from all opportunities of information, beyond what they received from themselves, or by their direction."—Where, however, is the proof of such restrictions, or the probability that the people having left the established church, because of alledged tyranny, would have quietly yielded to a bondage like that which the Pope imposes on his subjects. What were these restrictions devised to exclude all communication with the established churches? Did they prohibit their people from all social intercourse with members of the Establishment? Did they forbid the reading of their books? Did they prevent all correspondence? We have a high opinion of these men, but we cannot be convinced without some proof that they had so much art and power, as to cut off so entirely all communications between their people, and the members of the national church. It is true the Seceders were then, and are still, opposed to what is called occasional or promiscuous communion, but this is a very different thing from excluding people from *all communication* with those with whom they do not commune. It is an undeniable fact, that the Seceders generally, if we may say so much in their defence, have much more liberality in communications with others, than many others with them. Though they feel no freedom in having communion with others in ordinances of worship, where they believe that there are corruptions in which they would offend God by partaking, yet they shut not themselves out from those means of communication of which they can avail themselves without sin. There are many of the members of this church, who occupy a portion of their time in reading. Go into their houses and examine their books; and though you will not find them willing to join in the bowing, the genuflexions, and other ceremonies of episcopacy, you will find them reading and prizing the works of Messrs. Hervy and Scott, and other evangelical Episcopalians. Though they object to the system of Independent government, yet they will read Drs. Owen and Edwards, and prize such men as highly as any of their adversaries. And though they cannot relish the strains of Dr. Watts, and other imitators and hymn-makers, and feel no freedom to join in a communion polluted by doctrines and measures, subversive of the gospel, and where the invitation given to them, would be given with the same freedom to Papists, Socinians and every thing coming under the Christian name, yet they will read the works of Dr. Watts and his defenders; they read the writings of such men as Drs. Miller and Alexander; they read the Standard, the Christian Herald, the Presbyterian and the Repertory. How much this liberality is reciprocated the articles reviewed may testify.

It is believed that few respectable members of the Secession would publish to the world accounts of the General Assembly, containing as great mistakes about their principles, as these articles emanating from such a respectable source, contain respecting the Seceders, and to what cause can this be attributed, but an unwillingness to examine their writings. It will be vain to say that there are no writers among them worth reading. Not to say any thing of the Messrs. Erskines, Brown, Gib, and other fathers of the Secession, the religious and literary history of this age will place the names of Drs. Anderson, M'Crie, Jamieson, Professor Paxton, Mr. Stevenson, and others on the list of the most eminent of authors. And surely if the editors of the *Repertory* had read the writings of these men, they would have perceived that they never could have remained in connexion with a society, holding the narrow principles and acting from the unworthy motives which they have been pleased to attribute to the Seceders. We wish still to make no impeachment of the candor of our brethren, but are sorry that they should have published to the world some of the serious accusations contained in their periodical without more careful investigation.

It has been said that one effect of the Secession was to check the high handed measures pursued by the Established Church. This, however, seems to have operated most powerfully at the first. When the greater portion of the people who were zealously attached to the principles of the Reformation, had united with the Seceders, it seems as if the Assembly became less fearful of losing what was left, and ceased to be so careful in their measures. The moderate party, who took a name as opposite as possible from their true spirit, carried on with a high hand; they drove out of their communion, in some cases even out of Scotland, some of the most eminent of their ministers, such as Mr. Gillespie, the father of the Relief Church, and Dr. Witherspoon, who took refuge from their oppressions by removing to America, and became one of the brightest ornaments of our country.

In another respect, the effect of the Secession was altogether unfavorable. As it might naturally have been anticipated the separation of those who had been most forward in opposing corrupt doctrine, was much felt and lamented by those friends of truth who were left behind, and some of them after struggling in vain, for a time, ceased even to attend upon meetings of the Assembly; so that grievous errors were suffered to pass without any notice, or were only visited with such inadequate censures as tended to give them encouragement. Of these cases it may be proper to give a few examples.

Mr. John Glass had been deposed in 1730, for advocating the Independent system of church government, opposing Creeds and Confessions, and teaching the doctrines, afterwards more generally known by the name of Sandemanianism, from Mr. Sandeman, a coadjutor or successor of Mr. Glass; but in 1739, he was relieved from this sentence by the Assembly, after which he became the father of the abovenamed sect. Dr. Wm. Wishart, principal of the university of Edinburgh, was brought before the Assembly of 1738 for denying in published discourses, the doctrine of original sin, maintaining the sufficiency of the light of nature, opposing Creeds and Confessions, and the instruction of children by catechisms, &c. Dr. Wm. Leechman, professor of divinity, was also brought before the Assembly of 1744, for asserting in a printed sermon, "that God merely as *Creator* is the proper object of prayer; that an assured trust in the goodness and mercy of God *as Creator*, is the principal

means of acceptance in prayer;" that the light of nature is sufficient as a guide, and that natural ability is sufficient for the performance of prayer without the intercession of Christ, or the influences of the Holy Spirit. Both these men, occupying such important stations, and teaching such radical errors, were dismissed without any retraction, simply on the ground of their renewed declaration of adherence to the Confession of Faith. Mr. James Meek, minister at Cambuslang was brought before the Assembly in 1775 on a charge, by elders and members of his congregation, of teaching that sincerity was the ground of our acceptance with God; that we know of no cause for Christ's agony in the garden, except the apprehension of what he was to suffer from his disciples and his enemies; that all have a right to come to the Lord's Table, however enormous their crimes have been, if they resolve to do better; that sinners can make some compensation to God for their former enormities, that they have the merits of Christ to co-operate with their sincere endeavours; and that when faith goes above or beyond reason it is credulity. Yet the Assembly refused to take any notice of his erroneous doctrine, and decided to "sustain Mr. James Meek as minister of Cambuslang."—[*Appendix to the Re-exhibition of the Judicial Testimony.* pp. 168, 170.]

At the time of the declinature, 1739, the number of the Seceding ministers appears to have been only eight. In 1742, there were twenty, Mr. Wm. Wilson had been removed by death, twelve had been added by ordination, and one by accession. In 1744, they agreed to a division into three Presbyteries, viz. Dunfermline, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, the two former consisting of eight ministers each, the latter of nine. The number of settled ministers at this time was twenty-five, the congregations settled and vacant, forty-one. In 1747, when the breach took place respecting the burgess oath, the Synod consisted of thirty-two ministers. Of these, one, Mr. Thomas Someville took part with neither side; of the remaining thirty-one, nineteen took the side of opposition to the oath, and were called, anti-burghers; twelve were in favor of it and were called Burghers. In 1774, the anti-burgher Synod was composed of eleven Presbyteries, and about one hundred ministers. At the present time the whole number of the congregations of the Secession in Scotland, together with those of the Relief is estimated in the Repertory at 470, about equal to one half the number of those of the established Church. The members of the United Secession alone, are supposed to embrace a fifth or a fourth part of the whole population. Their ministers are said to be about equal to one half the number of the established Clergy, (948). There are probably upwards of two hundred ministers of the United Secession in Ireland; their number is probably about the same with that of the Presbyterians of the Synod of Ulster, who are dissenters in Ireland, as well as the Seceders; Episcopacy being established by law. There are other branches of the Secession, both in Scotland and Ireland of whose numbers we have not any accurate information. The number of Seceders in the Provinces of the north is not accurately known, but it is long since they had a Synod in Nova Scotia. There are a few congregations of them, in different parts of England. In the United States, there are eighty-six ministers of those properly called Seceders, and about the same number of the Associate Reformed, who sometimes go by this name, from their having generally belonged to the Secession before that union with the Reformed Presbytery or Covenanters which separated them from us. The whole number

of ministers in the Secession may therefore be considered as about eight hundred or one thousand. Yet this increase from the four first to eight hundred or one thousand, is nothing, compared with the progress of many other Societies. The Methodists have perhaps increased in a five or ten fold proportion. And it would be far more worthy of gratulation if we had increased or even not declined in the love and zeal for which our fathers were distinguished.

That which may justly be regarded as the most important effect of the Secession, was its influence in the promotion of the truth of the gospel. The controversies which began to be agitated in the days of Mr. Thomas Boston respecting the nature of the gospel, tended very much to expose the legal spirit which prevailed, and to elucidate the doctrines of grace. He and those who afterwards formed the Secession stood side by side in this contest for the grace of Christ as the Saviour, as well as for his rights as the King and head of the church. And had he not been removed by death there is no reason to doubt, but as he had been with them in maintaining the truth, so he could not have parted from them when they were called to suffer for it. What has been stated in former papers may show what was the occasion of the Secession, but if we look at the proper grounds of it, we will find that the thing which led the way, was the opposition made by the Assembly to the truths of the gospel, and these truths became the chief matters of testimony, on the part of the Seceeders. But to do justice to this portion of their history, and of their Testimony, it will be necessary to go back, and give some account of those things which occasioned their act respecting the doctrine of grace, which was a judicial deed, subsequent to the Testimony, yet regarded as a part of it; and this will require a separate section.

[To be continued.]

---

#### ART. II. *Remarks on the ancient mode of singing Psalms.*

It is very probable that many are unacquainted with the origin of the practice still followed in many congregations, of giving out the lines of the Psalm to enable all to join in singing it. It is also probable that those who oppose any change from this practice are chiefly influenced by a respect to what they regard as an ancient custom. But whilst zeal against innovations is to be commended and cherished, especially in such an age as the present, it appears in this instance to be misguided. The custom of giving out the line has neither the sanction of antiquity, nor of the practice of the purest of the Reformed Churches in the age of the Reformation.

The occasion of this custom in Scotland was the introduction of the present authorized version of the Psalms. Previous to the preparation of this version, or *paraphrase*, as a different version was then called, the congregation was accustomed to follow in singing either by a psalm book or by memory. But the books in the hands of the people, and the psalms which they had committed to memory were of no more use to them when the new version was introduced. In order therefore to facilitate its introduction, the expedient of giving out the line was employed, but at the same time, it was recommended to the people to return as soon



as possible to their former mode of singing without any such interruption.

The act of the Westminster Assembly is well known, yet perhaps not a few have never adverted to its true spirit. It is in the following terms: "That the whole congregation may join herein, [in singing of psalms.] every one that can read is to have a psalm book; and all others, not disabled by age or otherwise, are to be exhorted to learn to read. But for the present, where many in the congregation cannot read, it is convenient that the minister, or some other fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the Psalm, line by line, before the singing thereof." The first part of this act enjoins that all who could read should have psalm books; others who could not read were to be exhorted to learn; and why are these things mentioned in connexion with singing psalms if they contemplated the continuance of giving out the line, in which case those who could read, would have no advantage over those who could not, and those who had books would have no advantage over those who had none? It is very evident that these words of the Assembly intimate that singing by book, and not by giving out the line, is the proper mode. Then it is added, "But for the present, &c." This *But*, also intimates something different in what is recommended from the standing rule implied in the previous sentence. This expedient of giving out the line, they also mention as temporary, it was to be only "for the present." It is also limited to certain places "where" certain circumstances required it, they say not in all worshipping assemblies, but only, "*where*" congregations labor under a certain difficulty, implying that where this difficulty did not exist there was no occasion for the proposed expedient even for the present. They do not justify the giving out of the line where this difficulty occurs only to a small extent, but say "*where many* in the congregation cannot read." They also place this expedient on no higher ground than that of *convenience*. They say nothing of the case of the blind, whose situation has more frequently furnished an apology for giving out the line in modern times. Perhaps the argument drawn from this case would not be so strong, as an argument from the case of the deaf, or dull of hearing in favour of written forms of prayer. The blind could generally follow in singing from memory, but the deaf are quite shut out from participation in prayer unless forms were allowed for their convenience.

The preceding view of this act certainly corresponds with its language; and that it also agrees with its spirit and intention, appears from the account which is given of the preparation and adoption of it in Doctor Lightfoot's "Journal of the Assembly of Divines." From this Journal it appears that the Commissioners from Scotland opposed this clause which allows of the reading of the lines: and though the original form of the act is not given in the Journal, it is altogether probable that when it was committed to these Commissioners, it was limited and modified agreeably to the views above expressed. The following is the passage alluded to.

"Then was our Directory for singing psalms read over to the Scots Commissioners, who were absent at the passing of it; and Mr. Henderson disliked our permission of any to read the psalms line by line: and this business held us some debate: which ended in this,—that the Scots were desired to draw up something to this purpose."—(*Lightfoot's Works, Vol. XIII. p. 344. Edition of 1825.*)

The following extract from Stewart's Collections will cast some light

on the preceding act of the Westminster Assembly, and confirm some of the preceding observations.

"By the act of Assembly [of the Church of Scotland,] August 6, 1649, their Commission being empowered to emit the paraphrase of the Psalms, and establish the same for public use, they did accordingly conclude and establish the paraphrase of the Psalms in metre, now used in this church, after the Presbyteries had sent their animadversions thereupon."

"It was the ancient practice of the church, as it is yet of some Reformed Churches abroad, for the minister or precentor to read over as much of the psalm in metre together, as was intended to be sung at once, and then the harmony, and melody followed without interruption, and people did either learn to read, or get most of the psalms by heart; but afterwards, it being found, that when a new paraphrase of the psalms was appointed, it could not at first be so easy for the people to follow, then it became customary, that each line was read by itself, and then sung. But now, having for so long time made use of this paraphrase, and the number of those who can read being increased, it is but reasonable that the ancient custom should be revived, according to what is insinuated by the Directory on this subject. And that such who cannot read may know what psalms to get by heart, let such be affixed on some conspicuous part of the pulpit as are to be sung in public at next meeting of the congregation. It were to be wished that masters of families would path [pave] the way for the more easy introducing of our former practice, by reviving and observing the same in their family worship."—(*Stewart's Collections, Book II. Tit. I. Sect. 25, 26.*)

The French Protestant Church in their 10th Synod, which met at Figeac in 1579, passed the following act:

"Churches that in singing psalms do first cause each verse to be read, shall be advised to forbear that childish custom, and such as have used themselves unto it shall be censured."—(*Quick's Synodicon, Vol. I, p. 132.*)

These extracts sufficiently show that the custom of giving out the lines was no part of the Reformation, but was subsequently introduced to a limited extent for the sake of convenience in certain cases rarely if ever occurring in the present day. They also show that the most reformed assemblies and purest churches in the first days of the Reformation set themselves against this custom, urging people to learn to read, and to furnish themselves with psalm books, that they might sing without any interruption. It is no ways difficult to ascertain what the judgment of the Westminster Assembly would be in cases, where there were not "many in the congregation unable to read," and where there could be no difficulty in all supplying themselves with books. The judgment of the Reformed Church of France needs no comment. It was not however intended to enter into an argument on this subject which has frequently produced disturbances in different denominations, but merely to supply a few extracts to enable any who feel an interest in it to judge for themselves, what were the sentiments and usages of former times.

PHILODOS.

ART. III. *Brief Expositions of Important Texts.*

MR. EDITOR—

I have thought it might be useful, to give in the Monitor a brief exposition of some passages in the bible, which are often proposed for explanation; and the meaning of which has been often mistaken. I have followed this practice for some years, from the pulpit, immediately before paraphrasing on the psalm, and I trust not without benefit. Should the plan meet your approbation, I may, occasionally send a few remarks on other passages.

W. E.

“But to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but *it shall be given to them*, for whom it is prepared of my Father.”—Matth: xx. 23.

In this verse, the words in italic, “*it shall be given them*,” inserted in our English version, are not in the original. The translators, by the insertion, doubtless intended to explain the verse, but unhappily, it not only perverts the meaning, but darkens the proofs which the verse contains, of our Saviour’s deity. Read the words as uttered by our Lord, leaving out the addition of the translators, and the meaning is obvious at once. “To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but for whom, it is prepared of my Father.” This proves that Christ has the thrones and mansions of Heaven, at his disposal. He has power, as God, to bestow them; but He will give them only to those, whom the Father hath given him as his people:—only to those, whom he covenanted from eternity to redeem, and for whom, God the Father hath prepared glory, as the reward of his sufferings on their behalf. As it stands in our English version, some might be ready to suppose, that Christ has no right to give a throne in heaven, even to his dearest disciple. “To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared, of my Father.” This addition, represents the Saviour as saying, that though he had no right to give a seat in glory, yet all for whom it was prepared, should, in due time, be put in possession of this glory, by God, the Father. The passage, however, as it stands in the original, instead of denying this divine power to Christ, is thus a proof not only of the covenant entered into from eternity, between the Father, Son and Spirit, for the salvation of an elect world:—not only of the certainty of the salvation of all, for whom Jesus died; but also, of his equality with the Father. Indeed, the doctrine of the Saviour’s Deity, is plainly written on every page of the bible. Deny his divinity, and the bible is a book without meaning. The titles, attributes, and works of God are expressly, and without limitation, ascribed to Jesus, as Jehovah Sabaoth, the Lord of hosts, as God over all, blessed forever. His essential Deity—his true and proper Godhead is acknowledged by all the hosts of heaven, where they “honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.” Wo! to the polluted worm of the dust, who dares refuse to unite in the ascription of praise, with which all heaven resounds: “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. Blessing, and honor, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.”

2d Cor. ii. 17. “For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ.”

The word here correctly rendered *corrupt*, literally signifies also, to adulterate, as a dishonest dealer mixes good and bad merchandize together, or as an unjust vintner mixes his wine with water, or poisons it with deleterious ingredients, that it may "give its color in the cup," and sell to advantage. Thus false teachers adulterate the pure word of God, and corrupt the gospel, by human additions to the perfect rule, by infusing poisonous mixtures into the water of life. *They* are guilty of this sin then, who add to, or take from the pure and perfect word of God; who by human inventions, and useless mixtures would weaken the efficacy of the truth, and deprive of its nourishing qualities, the bread of life. Their pretended regard to fundamentals, assumed, as a plausible pretext for vending, with impunity, their poisonous mixtures, may pass as sufficient with men; but it will not shield from the doom denounced against those who "handle the word of God deceitfully." As wine mixed with water is deprived of its strength, so the least addition to the word, the least corruption of the institutions of the Most High, may rob them of their efficacy, and render them but a savor of death unto death to the soul. But more is implied in the word "*corrupt*," than this. It imports not only that the addition, like wine in water, may deprive the word and institution of its value, but, that this addition is a poisonous and deadly ingredient, which may bring on the deluded victim eternal destruction. It is needless to particularize the different corruptions of God's word, which, in the present day defile the church and endanger souls. Every addition, however, to the truths or institutions of Jehovah, is a corruption of his word, and a usurpation of his prerogatives and his throne. To the dishonest merchant Satan holds out the prospect of gain: to the false and dishonest teacher, he presents the same temptation, or perhaps the bubble, popularity—the praise of men. Alas! sometimes it succeeds. The blood of souls is sold for the breath of dying worms;—or they are left to perish for want of the bread of life, or poisoned with error, lest the teacher be unpopular! O how necessary the injunction of the inspired penman of our text to Timothy, and to every minister: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, preach the word." Preach the uncorrupted word. Preach as one who seeks souls, not his own glory. Preach as one who feels that he has more to secure and labor for, than the praise of deceived and dying men. Preach the word as one who dreads to have the blood of souls on his hands, at a judgment day. Up, and do the work of the Lord as one in earnest. Preach as one who has utterly forgotten self, not as one whose pride has sought even the pulpit for display. Deliver your message as God has written it. With prayers and many tears, plead that your every sermon may be the very truth most pure; and studied, and spoken, as though the destiny of deathless spirits, through all the ages of eternity, were depending upon it.

By the majesty of Him whose commission you bear and whose word you proclaim; by the worth of souls which that word alone can save, preach it in purity; that when the heart faileth in the day of death, you may be able, looking back on a past life, to appeal and say; "we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God in the sight of God," have we spoken in the name of Christ, and for the promotion of his glory.



ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 125.)

The divinity of Christ proved a sad bone of contention among the Jews, who judged of him from his mean appearance, and not from his godlike works and words. At one time he tells them, *I and my father are one.* John x. 30. The Jews understood his meaning well, and cried out, *We stone thee for blasphemy, because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.* John x. 33.

At another time he says, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*—John v. 17. I work with uncontrolled power, as my Father works; and all things obey me and my Father equally; and hereupon the Jews sought to kill him, because he had said, that *God was his Father*, (*ἰσὶν πατέρα*, his own proper, or peculiar Father) *making himself thereby equal with God.* (Verse 18.) The Jews knew, though some among ourselves do not, what Jesus meant by calling God his *own proper* Father. They perceived by this expression, that he made himself so partake of his Father's *divine* nature, as an earthly son partakes of his father's *human* nature, which is the same in both; and that Jesus hereby would distinguish himself both from angels, who are *created* sons of God; and from believers, who are *adopted* sons; and for this expression, which seemed presumptuous and blasphemous, they sought to kill him.

On another occasion, Jesus took the incommunicable name to himself, saying, *Before Abraham was, I am;* and this so enraged the Jews, *that they took up stones to cast at him.* (John viii. 58, 59.) Now stoning was the legal punishment for *blasphemy.* (Levit. xxiv. 16.)

When Jesus is accused of blasphemy, for making himself God, he never does refute the charge; but either vindicates his high claim in a *covert* way, (which was needful then, that his death might not be hastened) or he passeth over the charge in silence. And is silence, in such a weighty matter, consistent with the character of Jesus? If he had not been Jehovah, surely it behoved him, when called a blasphemer, to tell them plainly, "You mistake my words; I am not God, nor mean to call myself so."

This charge of blasphemy pursued Jesus through his ministry, and at length nailed him to the cross. At his trial, he is first brought before the Jewish council, where some frivolous things are urged, but nothing proved. Then Caiaphas stands up, and says, *Art thou the Son of the blessed?* Christ's appointed hour was now come, and his answer is no longer covert, *Jesus saith, I am.* The high priest, knowing well the meaning of his words, *rends his clothes, and says, what need have we of further witnesses? Ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.* (Mark xiv. 61, &c.)

Next he is hurried before the bar of Pilate, to have their sentence confirmed. Here again some idle matters are first urged, but not regarded by the governor. Jesus is accused of aspiring to be king, but satisfies Pilate by declaring *his kingdom is not of this world.* At length the capital charge of *blasphemy* is brought, which finished the trial. *We have a law, say the Jews, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.* Pilate, hearing this, was much afraid; and going to the judgment-hall again, says to Jesus, *whence art thou?* But Jesus gave him no answer. *Pilate saith, speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee?* Jesus answered, *thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were*

given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee, hath the greater sin. This answer somewhat checked Pilate, but an outcry from the Jews quickens him, and he passeth sentence. (John xix. 7, &c.)

Thus both at the bar of Caiaphas and Pilate, the capital charge brought against Jesus was blasphemy, or the calling himself in a peculiar sense the Son of God, and thereby making himself *equal* with God. For this he was condemned to die; and he suffered death, as a blasphemer, for laying claim to divinity. And were he now in Britain, a multitude of those, who are fed at his altar, would lift a heel against him, and hale him to a gibbet, and cry out as before, *If thou be the Son of God, come down from thy gallows, and we will believe that thou art the proper Son of God, neither an adopted Son, nor a created Son, but the only begotten Son of the Father.* (John i. 18.)

Perhaps they might go further, so great is their zeal, and having crucified the Saviour on a false charge of blasphemy, might crucify his followers on a base pretence of idolatry. A minute philosopher has dared to publish muttering words about it; one, who likes to live upon the alms arising from the Lord's service; and can say genteely, *hail master*, and betray the master's honor, as a friend of old did.

When Jesus says, *the Father is greater than he*; and the Son is ignorant of the day of Judgment; these things must be ascribed to his human nature. As touching his Godhead, he is equal to the Father, being declared, to be *one* with the Father, one in nature, and bearing his *express image*; but as touching his manhood, is inferior to the Father, and his human nature, we are told, *grew in wisdom and stature*, which supposeth a finite boundary. And though at last the kingdom of Christ will be delivered up to the Father, this must be understood of his mediatorial kingdom. All things are administered at present by the hand of Jesus, as God-man mediator; but when this dispensation ends, the kingdom will return to its original order; and when thus returned, it is not said, the Father will be all in all, but *God* (the triune God) will be all in all.

That the Son will not lose his *essential* kingdom, as God, when his *mediatorial* kingdom, as God-man ceaseth, seems plain from these words of the Father to the Son, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*; which words ascribe an *everlasting* dominion to the Son, when his mediatorial kingdom is no more.

Thus, Sir, I have given you a summary proof of Christ's divinity from the Bible; and can you suppose that the scriptures would tell you plainly again and again, that Jesus Christ is *Jehovah*; is *God*; the *true God*; the *mighty God*; the *just God*; and *God over all, blessed for evermore*, if he was not truly God? All these lofty expressions are applied to Jesus Christ, and they would naturally mislead plain men, yea, and would confound all plain language, if he is not truly God. A man must have the old serpent's subtlety, and chop and mince his logic mighty fine, who can banish Christ's divinity out of these expressions. But what then must become of the poor, who are the chief subjects of the gospel-kingdom? They cannot buy the spawn of subtle brains; nor, if purchased, could digest it. They have nothing but the Bible; and if Jesus is not truly God, the Bible would mislead them; and so for want of a scribe's cap and dictionary, they must all miscarry truly.

You have heard before, that *the wise are taken in their own craftiness*; and now, Sir, hear how the Lord *takes* them. Gins and snares are scattered in his word to catch a subtle scribe; just as traps are laid by us to catch a fox or foulmart. Every fundamental doctrine meets with some-

thing, which *seems* directly to oppose it; and these *seeming* contradictions are the traps, which are laid. A lofty scribe, who depends upon his own subtlety, and cannot pray sincerely for direction, is sure to be taken in these snares; but an humble praying soul escapes them; or if his foot be caught, the snare is broken, and his soul delivered.

Some things spoken of the *human nature* of Christ, and of his *mediatorial* character and office, are the traps laid about his divinity, to catch a modern scribe; as the meanness of Christ's appearance in Judea, was a trap to catch an ancient rabbi.

Isaiah has an awful word about these traps, which are laid around the Saviour's person. *He (Jesus) shall be for a sanctuary (unto some), but for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* (Isa. viii. 14.) And they were taken in the snare; for they crucified the Lord of glory, as a vile blasphemer.

No one has cause to complain of these traps, because the Holy Spirit's guidance is promised to all them, that seek it earnestly; and if men are too lazy or too lofty to seek this assistance, they are justly suffered to *stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken* (Isa. viii. 15.)

But, Sir, if you would take a modern rabbi for your tutor, and seat yourself beneath his feet, and catch the droppings of his mouth; whither, whither must you fly for shelter? Alas! the modern scribes are just in such a hobble now about Jesus, as the Jewish scribes were. Some said then, *he is John the Baptist*; others said, no, *he is Elias*; and others contradicted both, and called him, *Jeremias, or one of the prophets*. So it was then; and so it is now. Some say, he is a *mere man*, as the Turk's say; and such professors only need a pair of whiskers, to pass for muselmens. Other say, he has an *angel's nature*, but his head and shoulders taller than the highest angel. Others contradict them both, and say he is a God; but having lost a small article in St. John's greek gospel, he is not the God. Others laugh at this, and say, he is no God at all, but hoisted into Godship by his office; and must be worshipped in a lower strain, as wily courtiers worship princes, as starving levities worship patrons, as antiquarians worship rust, or as Christian men will worship mammon.

Again, whilst some affirm, he is not truly God, others have affirmed, he was not truly man, or had no real human nature; and so amongst them all, they have stript him worse than the Roman soldiers did, who took his cloathes, yet left his carcase; but these rogues have run away with every thing. According to their various fancies, he is neither God, nor angel, nor man; and what else they can make him, I see not, unless it be a *devil*, as the Jewish scribes made him, (John viii. 52)

Thus Jesus proves a sad stone of *stumbling* to the lofty scribes, who flounder round about him, and bedaub him grievously, but cannot get up to him; and as every scribe grows sharper than his brother, some new nature is invented for the Saviour. And Sir, if you renounce the plain account of the Bible, you will find as many caps for Christ's head, as there are maggots in a scribe's brain.

If Jesus Christ is not truly God, all his apostles, excepting Judas, were idolaters: for they *worshipped* him with great solemnity at his ascension. (Luke xxiv. 52.) Also all the Christians of the first and purest age were idolaters; for we learn from undoubted heathen records, that they prayed and sang praises to *one Jesus*, according to the character given them by Paul, *They call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord in eve-*

ry place. (I Cor. i. 2.) Yea, and all the angels too, except the devils, are highly guilty of idolatry; for they sing delightful praises into God and the Lamb. (Rev. v. xi, 12.) Which adoration puts the devils, who are utter haters of idolatry, in a cruel rage at the book of Revelations, where this worship is recorded; and makes them raise up human tools to vilify the book, and try to banish it from the sacred canon.

Enough, enough, Doctor; put no more shieves upon the cart, lest you break it down. An overstocked market oversets it commonly: and a drove of lean proofs coming after the other, may prove like Pharaoh's second drove of lean oxen, which devoured all the fat ones. I would have no more than just enough of the best fed goose; cramming only breeds a surfeit. And I have heard enough to satisfy me, that Jesus is my maker and preserver, the God in whom I live and move and have my being, who deserves my highest worship and my best obedience.—And it seems agreeable to common sense, that none can *redeem* a world, but the *Maker* of it. Yet I am still in the dark about your new covenant. How does it differ from the old; and how must I get a slice of the new Nature, you say, cannot carve for herself: who then must do this office for her, and put the meat upon her trencher?

An answer to both your questions, will occasion some little repetition, Sir, yet not a needless one, since it respects the *way* to life, which is too commonly mistaken.

In a covenant of works, a man must work for life by his *own will* and *power*, or by the natural abilities he is endowed with. He stands upon his own legs, and had need look well to them: for the tenor of this covenant is, *do and live; transgress and die*. A single trip ruins all, as in angels, so in Adam: but if the whole is kept without a flaw, a right to life is purchased by virtue of the covenant *promise*.

In the covenant of grace, all things are *purchased* for us; and *bestowed* upon us, *graciously* or *freely*.

These two covenants are called the old and new: no more are noticed in scripture; and a suitable *law*, respecting both, is mentioned, the *law of works*, and the *law of faith*. (Rom. iii. 27.) All other laws are cobwebs of an human brain, such as the law of *sincere obedience*, the law of *love*, &c. For love and obedience are the *fruits* of faith, and not the *law* of the new covenant.

And now, Sir, God himself shall tell you by the mouth of Jeremiah, what the new covenant is. *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, not like that I made at Sinai; but this shall be the covenant, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my people; I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their sins no more.* (Jerem. xxxi. 31, &c.) And to this St. Paul alludes, Heb. viii. 8, &c. x. 16, 17.

Ezekiel describes this covenant more minutely, *I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; I will cleanse you from all your filthiness and all your idols; I will give you a new heart, and I will put a new spirit in you; I will take the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes.* (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, &c.)

The new covenant is here shewn to consist of a rich and gracious bundle of free promises, in which *I will* and *I will* runs through the whole. God does not say, "Make yourselves obedient, and then I will sprinkle clean water upon you, to wash away guilt;" but he says, "*I will* do both; *I will* pardon you, and make you obedient also; yea, *I will* do



every thing, and do it by *my Spirit*. Not your own might, but *my Spirit* shall sanctify your heart, and engage your feet to walk in my statutes."

This covenant is too glorious for nature to behold: she shrinks from the dazzling sight; fears woeful consequences from it; and, trembling for morality, beseeches the vicar to marry Moses unto Jesus, and couple the two covenants. From this adulterous alliance springs the spurious covenant of faith and works, with a spruce new set of duties, half a yard long, called legally-evangelical, or evangelically-legal; unknown to Christ and his apostles, but discovered lately by some ingenious gentlemen.

However, Jesus does not thank old nature for her fears. He has promised in his covenant, to provide a new heart, and good feet, as well as justification and pardon; and what he promiseth, he will perform. Jesus does not want the staff of Moses; nor will the master of the house suffer an alliance with his servant.

And so much, Sir, for the nature of the new covenant: your next question was, how do we become partakers of it? Now the blessings of this covenant were all purchased by Jesus, and are lodged in his hand to dispose of; free pardons to bless a guilty sinner, free grace to sanctify his nature, with full power to lead him safe to Canaan. Jesus therefore says, *look to me, and be saved; come to me, and I will give you rest.*—But the bare command and invitation of his word will not bring us to him.

Nature lost her legs in paradise, and has not found them since: nor has she any *will* to come to Jesus. The way is steep and narrow, full of self-denials, crowded up with stumbling-blocks; she cannot like it: and when she does come, it is with huge complaining. Moses is obliged to flog her tightly, and make her heart ache, before she casts a weeping look on Jesus. Once she doated on this Jewish lawgiver, was fairly wedded to him, and sought to please him by her *works*, and he seemed a kindly husband: but now he grows so fierce a tyrant, there is no bearing of him. When she takes a wry step, his mouth is always full of cursing; and his resentments so implacable, no weeping will appease him, nor promise of amendment.

Why, Doctor, you are got into your altitudes: I do not understand you. Figures are above my match: I never could get through arithmetic. Pray, let us have plain English.

So you shall, sir. Man is born under the law of works, and of course is wedded to that law: it is the law of nature. Traces of the moral law are still upon his heart; the fall has blotted the two tables, but not defaced them wholly. Where revelation is bestowed, the tables are renewed, as at Sinai; but wrote as yet in stone; not on the heart; recorded in the sacred volume, but not engraven on the inward parts. By means of this outward revelation and the moral sense, men acquire some notion of a covenant of works. This covenant suits their nature, and is understood in a measure, though neither in its full extent nor in its awful penalties. Jesus begins his lectures with the *law of works*, somewhat known to the scholar, and urges that law on his conscience with vigor, to drive him to the *law of faith*. The young Israelite is called to Mount Sinai, where Jesus trains his people now, as he did aforetime. And until the heart has had a thorough schooling here, has heard and felt the thunders of the law, it will be hard and stony. It may be pitiful to others, but want compassion for itself; may weep at a neighbor's ruin, but cannot truly feel for its own. The bosom is bound about

with wrappers of obedience, that when the curses of the law are heard they only tingle in the ear and graze upon the breast, but do not pierce the conscience. The man knoweth not his real danger: the law of works refreshes him; and while he sippeth comfort from his faint obedience, Jesus Christ is only used as a make-weight,—like the small dust thrown in the scale to turn the balance.

Now the legal heart is crushed at Sinai: there Jesus Christ, by his Spirit, sets the law home upon the sinner's conscience; then he *feels* that the curses in the law are his proper portion, not because he is the chief of sinners, but because he is a sinner. Thus his bosom is unswaddled, the heart begins to bleed, the mouth is stopped quite, all legal worthiness is gone, he stands condemned by the law, and *all* his hope is fixed on Jesus. While the law was only written on paper, he found no galling condemnation. His heart, like the stony tables, received the letter, and felt no impression; but when the commandment reached his inmost soul, then he died. This makes a *free* salvation highly needful, a *whole* Saviour truly precious, and a *pure* covenant of grace delightful. And now the scholar comes to Jesus Christ, with cap in hand, and bended knee, and bleeding heart, and with St. Peter's gospel prayer, *Lord, save, or I perish.*

Being thus convinced of sin, his heart can have no rest till he *receives* a pardon, and finds that peace of God *which passeth understanding*. He feels a real condemnation; and must have absolution, not from man but God. Once he prayed for pardon, and rose up from his knees contentedly without it. His heart was whole; he did not want a pardon; nay, it seemed a presumption to expect it. Yet sure what we may *ask* without presumption, we may *expect* without presumption. But now the scholar sees his legal title unto heaven is lost, and finds a legal condemnation in his own breast beside, which makes him hasten to the *surety*, and call upon him, *as the Lamb of God who takes away our sins, and as the Lord our righteousness*. He views the surety as his law-fulfiller; both as his *legal title* and his *legal sacrifice*; and he wants an application of these blessings to his heart—an application by the Holy Spirit, to witness that they are placed to his account.

He sees a need, that both the *legal title* and the *legal sacrifice* should be imputed, to answer all the law's demands. And he marvels much that any who allow the imputation of Christ's *death* should yet object to the imputation of his *life*; since, if the obedience of Christ's death may be *imputed*, or placed to our account for pardon, why may not the obedience of his life be *imputed* also for justification, or a title unto glory? One is full as easy to conceive of as the other: both are purchased by the surety; both are wanted to discharge our legal debts; and both will be embraced and sought with eagerness when our debts and wants are truly known. But here the matter sticks; men do not feel their wants, and so reject *imputed* righteousness. The heart must be broken down and humbled well before it can *submit to this righteousness*. (Rom. x. 3.) Till we see ourselves utter bankrupts we shall *go about to establish our own righteousness*, and cannot rest upon the surety's obedience, the God-man's righteousness, as our legal title unto glory.

But, sir, this is not all. Every one who is born of God is made to hunger for *implanted* holiness, as well as thirst for *imputed* righteousness. They want a *meetness* for glory, as well as *title* to it; and know they could not bear to live with God, unless renewed in his image. Heaven would not suit them without holiness, nor could they see the face of God

without it. And having felt the *guilt* of sin and the *plague* of their sinful nature, by *conviction from the Holy Spirit*, (John xvi. 8.) this has taught them both to dread sin and loathe it: to *loathe* it for its vile uncleanness, and *dread* it for the curse it brings. They consider sin as bringing both the devil's nature and the devil's hell. They view it and detest it as the poison of the moral world, the filthiness of a spirit, the loathing of an Holy God, and such a cursed abomination as nothing but the blood of Christ could purge away.

And, sir, where *imputed righteousness* is not only *credited* as a gospel doctrine, but *received* by the Holy Spirit's application, it produces love to Jesus,—tender love with gratitude. And this divine love not only makes us willing to *obey* him, but makes us *like* him; for *God is love*.

*Christian holiness*, springing from the application of imputed righteousness is a glorious work indeed, far exceeding moral decency, its thin shadow and its dusky image. It is a true devotedness of heart to God, a seeking of his glory, walking in his fear and love, rejoicing in him as a reconciled Father, and delighted with his service as the only freedom.

Full provision is made for this holiness in the new covenant; and Jesus, the noble king of Israel, bestows it on his subjects. Let me repeat his words: *I will give a new heart, and put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes*. Believers look to him with prayer and faith; by looking are *transformed into his image*, (2 Cor. iii. 18.) and taste the blessed fruits of Canaan before they pass the banks of Jordan.

But, sir, the holiest Christian can put no trust in his holiness. His daily seeking to *grow in grace* proves his holiness defective. *Tekel* is wrote on every duty, *Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting*. (Dan. v. 27.) And he knows the meaning of those weighty words, applicable both to soul and body, *Verily, every man at his best estate, is altogether vanity*. (Psalm xxxix. 5.) His utmost holiness and his freest services do not answer the demand of God's law; and if depended on for justification in any measure, would bring him under the law's penalty, and condemn him. He is therefore forced to fly out of himself *entirely*, and seek a refuge *only* in Christ.

[To be continued.]

#### ART. V.—Decrease of Population in Heathen Nations.

[Communicated by a Missionary at the Sandwich Islands.]

I WISH to direct the attention of the Christian public to the distressing fact, that *heathen nations decrease rapidly before the march of civilization*; to assign some causes for the fact, and to speak of the influence which a fact of this kind should exert on the conduct of Christians.

No one at all conversant with history or acquainted with heathen nations, will deny that such is the fact. Look at South America. Where is her once numerous population? Gone, gone for ever! Where are the former occupants of the West Indies? Perished,—swept as with the besom of destruction. And how is it with the once numerous tribes who lined the shores of the Atlantic, where she washes what is now called New-England? Where are the warriors who once spread terror through the whole country, or who hunted their game where smiling villages,

with their numerous, busy population are now seen? Not a vestige remains of them to show the traveller where once they kindled their council fires, or lay in ambush to surprise and destroy their unsuspecting foe. And I surely need not ask, what are the prospects of the remaining tribes of Indians at the West and South! Thrust from the ranks of civilized nations, when about to assume the only standing which could prevent their irretrievable ruin, and trodden to the dust by the very men who had sworn to protect them, the heart of every Christian philanthropist in the land bleeds in anticipation of their speedy and utter extinction! So at the Sandwich Islands, and other islands of the Pacific where men from Christian countries have commenced the work of civilization. *Two*, at the lowest computation—I think *three*—*die* where *one* is born; and full half who are born die before they reach the age of three years. And this mortality obtains where means of civilization are most abundant.—A member of this mission, in a recent visit to Tahiti, saw a missionary of the London Missionary Society who had labored a few years on one of the Friendly Islands, unfrequented by men from other countries, and he stated the increase to be as two to four, or as great as the decrease at Tahiti and the Sandwich Islands. Wherever civilization has gone to the aid of the heathen, professedly to raise them from their degradation, they have sickened at her approach, and her embrace has been to them the embrace of death. Did heathen nations know the result of their intercourse with men from lands professedly Christian, they would cry out like the Ekronites on the approach of the ark of God—would flee from contact with men of other countries as they would avoid the plague.

But why is it so? Why should the heathen shrink away and die at the approach of civilization? Most certainly there is no necessity that such should be the result. The heathen are ignorant and uncivilized, and they need the aid of civilization; and they might derive incalculable benefit by their intercourse with men from Christian countries. The cause, then, why they derive no benefit from such intercourse must be sought in the character of foreigners who visit them, and in the course they have seen proper to pursue.

One reason why the intercourse of foreigners with heathen nations has proved so disastrous may be found in the fact, that the wants of the heathen have in consequence greatly increased, while the facilities for supplying those wants have been withheld. Merchants visit uncivilized nations, and make a display of their trinkets and goods; others land on their shores, and build houses, and purchase horses, and live after the style of their own country. The people see the superiority of the method of living adopted by their visitors, and they pine for these untried gratifications. Still, even if they may contrive to obtain these foreign commodities for a season, they cannot be said to derive benefit, permanent benefit, unless they are put in a way to supply their own wants. But those who profess to desire the civilization of the heathen are not forward to teach them the arts and usages of civilized life. They would keep them in ignorance, would render them dependent, that they might the more easily take advantage of their necessities. How was it with the Cherokee and Choc-taw tribes of Indians? While they continued their savage mode of life, were moving in their habits, idle and intemperate, and, of course, wasting away, little fear was expressed as to their influence on the community around them; they might indeed be vicious, and idle, and improvident, but they were a surer prey to the harpies who hovered about them, ready



to seize and bear away the last pittance in their possession. But no sooner did these tribes cease their wandering habits, and resolve on cultivating their soil, and becoming skilled in the arts and usages of civilized life, than they were compelled to feel the iron hand of oppression wrestling from them their all, and driving them naked into the wilderness. And I aver that this is the very spirit with which Christians have approached heathen nations.

But the chief reason why the intercourse of foreigners with heathen nations has proved so disastrous is found in the fact, that many of them have introduced almost every vice that can disgrace and ruin soul and body, while they scarcely practice a single virtue before the heathen.—This is a most affecting truth. Multitudes—not of the lower classes of society only—but men who would be thought *gentlemen*, intelligent and honorable, and who may have occupied a high rank in society at home—I say, multitudes of these men no sooner land on heathen shores, than they plunge headlong into scenes of dissipation; wallow in the slough of sinful indulgence. The miseries thus entailed upon the heathen are shocking beyond description, and are nearly irremediable. To specify,—look at the Sandwich Islands. For fifteen years the gospel has been preached at these islands, and every means employed to heal the maladies of the soul and body. Yet, after all, notwithstanding the force of example in their teachers, notwithstanding medical assistance and instruction to parents in rearing their children, notwithstanding every agency we can bring to bear upon the people, and notwithstanding the favorable changes which have actually taken place among them, the people are not healed; disease and death are not prevented; the people continue to decrease. And why? *Disease has contaminated their blood*; the seat of life is tainted, and loathsome and deadly diseases are transmitted from generation to generation. Oh, what disclosures will be made at the bar of God! What an account will Christian nations be called to render to the Judge of all the earth!

In view of these facts, let Christian nations feel their indebtedness to the heathen. Paul felt that he was a debtor to men of every character and description. So should Christians all feel, and, in view of this indebtedness, should they act. Oh, my friends, my Christian brethren, how cheerfully ought you, ought *we all*, to toil for the degraded heathen!—Had Christians been prompt in obeying the command of their ascending Lord, had they not waited till unprincipled men had polluted the heathen, and sown among them the seeds of disease and death, how much misery had been saved to the world! How much more easily might the gospel have been introduced into heathen lands! How many more might have been saved from perdition! I do assure you, dear friends, that I am often ashamed when I look into the face of a heathen, and I pray God to help me and you too, to be faithful in laboring in their behalf, that our garments may be clean from their blood.—*A. Quarterly Register.*

---

#### ART. VI. *English Unitarians.*

We copy below, from the numbers of the Congregational Magazine for April, May and June, the documents connected with the withdraw-

ment of the Unitarian Presbyterians from "the General Body of the three denominations of Protestant Dissenting ministers residing in and about London and Westminster."—*N. Y. Ch. Observer*.

From the Congregational Magazine for April.

*Attempted dissolution of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations.*

During the past months events have transpired in connection with the body of Dissenting Ministers in the metropolis, the importance of which, as they may affect the religious character and civil rights of that association, cannot at the present moment be estimated.

The nature of this transaction will be best understood, by a detailed account of the proceedings of the Unitarian body.

Our readers are aware that the General Body of Dissenting Ministers in the metropolis, is constituted by the union of three separate and independent societies, called the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Baptist Boards.

In the Congregational Board, constituting a majority of the whole body, there are no Unitarian members. The Baptist Board aforesaid have had a small minority of Unitarian Baptists attached to their list, though not meeting with them for business, but within a few months they have resolved that in future the names of those gentlemen shall not be reported to the general body in connection with their Board.

In the Presbyterian Board, however, the majority were Unitarian ministers, and only three of its members adhered to the Trinitarian opinions of its founders.

A long train of circumstances, which it is not possible now to explain, have made the Unitarians of the Presbyterian Board uneasy in their connection with the General Body, and therefore specially convened on the 4th of March, an extraordinary meeting at Red Cross Street, "to take into consideration the necessity of withdrawing from the two of the three denominations." The Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL. D., late of Leeds, but now of Carter Lane, was called to the chair.

The business was introduced by an elaborate speech by the Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney, who moved the adoption of a series of resolutions, which was seconded by the Rev. Thomas Madge, late of Norwich, but now the successor of Mr. Belsham, at Essex Street Chapel.

The Trinitarian members of the Board were in their places, and the Rev. Wm. Broadfoot, as their senior member, though laboring under the effects of serious illness, protested against the proposed proceedings.

The following resolutions were however proposed and carried, the chairman also begging to express his concurrence with them.

"Resolved, That this body, being one of the three bodies which constitute the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations in and about the cities of London and Westminster, feels itself impelled at the present crisis, to take prompt and decisive measures for the assertion of its independence, and the preservation of its rights and privileges.

"(1.) That the three bodies of Protestant Dissenting Ministers formed themselves into a united body upwards of a century ago, for the maintenance and extension of civil and religious liberty, upon the understanding and engagement that the bodies should not call in question or interfere with each other's religious opinions and doctrines; the only terms

of association with regard to individual members of the respective bodies, being their standing 'accepted and approved' in their several denominations.

"(2.) That notwithstanding known differences of judgment in religious matters between the three bodies, and, in some instances, between the members of the same body, the catholic principle of the union was, for a very long period, sacredly observed, and the united body consequently proceeded in peace and harmony, and by their cordial co-operation rendered eminent services to the cause of religious liberty; the Presbyterian body being certainly not behind the two others in zeal and exertion.

"(3.) That we lament that, within these few years, the catholic principle of the union has been infringed, by allowed references, at general meetings in the public proceedings, to doctrinal differences subsisting between the bodies, and the members of the same body, accompanied by reflections and insinuations to the prejudice particularly of the Presbyterian body.

"(4.) That we record with pain, that at the last election of the Secretary of the General Body, a most valuable and universally respected member of this body, who had, by the suffrages of the United Body, filled the secretaryship for seven years with such punctuality, diligence, and ability, as procured for him the warm thanks often repeated of the whole body, was set aside, on the ground openly alleged, and even declared in print, of his religious views on points of doctrine, and those of the body to which he belongs, not being consonant to those of the majority of the Three Denominations.

"(5.) That we perceive with feelings of deep regret the same spirit of intolerance and exclusion in the resolution of the Antipædobaptist body, not to admit to membership hereafter any Ministers, though hitherto eligible, who shall not profess certain articles of religious belief; and in the subsequent determination of the General Body upon the appeal of the aggrieved party, to take no measure for the relief of ministers who may be thus proscribed for conscience sake.

"(6.) That our serious attention has been also and of necessity drawn to various public proceedings of individuals and parties of the two other denominations; proceedings notoriously assisted by certain leading Ministers of one at least of those denominations—openly applauded by others—and approved, it is apprehended, by the greater part of them—the object or sure tendency of which is to degrade the English Presbyterians in public estimation, to deprive them of rights and privileges until this period never disputed, and even to revive against them, by means of legal technicalities, the penal statutes, which the wisdom and justice of the Legislature had repealed, to the satisfaction and joy of all enlightened men in the nation, and so far to thrust them out of the pale of civil protection,

"(7.) But contemplating the proceedings, and various indications of the disposition of the majority of the members, of the United Body of Ministers, we cannot entertain a doubt that it is the wish and purpose of such majority eventually to exclude the Presbyterian Body from the union, or to make its relative position such as no religious body alive to its own dignity, could consent to occupy. That, therefore, we feel it to be an imperative though painful duty—imposed on us equally by regard to our own characters as Protestant Dissenting Ministers, who hold it to be one of the inalienable rights of conscience, that no man shall, without his own consent, be answerable to another for his honest judgment upon the

sense of the Holy Scriptures, by respect for the memory of those that went before us and laid the foundation of our freedom, and by regard to the welfare of those that shall come after us,—to withdraw as a body from an union, the compact of which has been violated, and in which we see no prospect of equal and peaceful co-operation or of real and effective service to the interests of religious liberty,—our regret, however, is lessened by the pleasing reflection that the original purpose of the union has been, in great part, accomplished by the extension of the liberties of Protestant Dissenters, under the sway of the august family now upon the throne of these realms : and by the conviction that for what remains to be desired for the complete emancipation of conscience, we are justified by recent experience in placing entire confidence in his Majesty's present enlightened and liberal Government, which voluntarily proffers from the throne concessions which to religious freedom our fathers prayed for with faint hopes of success.

"In declaring, as we now do the Union of the Three Denominations dissolved, and in resolving to proceed hereafter in our single capacity as the Presbyterian Body of Ministers, unless an alteration in the spirit of the bodies with which we were lately associated should make re-union practicable and desirable, we disavow all angry and hostile feelings ;—we tender to the other denominations, with some of whose members we, as individuals, are and still hope to be united in the bonds of Christian esteem, our sincere wishes for their usefulness in the cause of freedom, truth, and virtue ; we preserve our sincere disposition to co-operate individually with the members of the other denominations in works of charity, in so far as doctrinal distinctions are kept out of sight, and all parties meet on terms of equality and unity ; and conscious that we have done nothing as a body to provoke this unhappy separation, but on the contrary have attempted every thing in our power to resist and retard it, we are willing to abide by the judgment of moderate and candid men, in the two other bodies of the Protestant Dissenters throughout the kingdom, of our countrymen at large, and of posterity, on this our deliberate and solemn act."

The Rev William Broadfoot, President of Cheshunt College ; the Rev. John Young, minister of Albion Chapel ; and the Rev. Robert Redpath, of Wells street Chapel, the orthodox members, met on Monday, March 7, and prepared the following *Protest* against the proceedings of the *Unitarian Majority* of the Presbyterian Board.

"Against the vote passed at the meeting of the Presbyterian body, on Friday last, the 4th inst, at the library, Red Cross street, for separating the said body from the two other bodies of the general body of the three denominations of Protestant dissenting ministers, the undersigned members of the Presbyterian body protest, for the following reasons :

1st. Whilst the undersigned have no right to object to any members of the Presbyterian body withdrawing, if they think proper, from the General Body of the Three Denominations, they maintain, that should such members constitute ever so large a majority, the minority, however small, can be in no respect constrained to concur in their act, but are entitled to remain as Presbyterians in the united Body of the Three Denominations, retaining all the privileges which they have hitherto enjoyed in consequence of their union with the other two bodies.

"2d. As the immediate result of the withdrawal of the Presbyterian Body from the other two, would be the breaking up and terminating of the General Body of the Three Denominations of Dissenting Ministers,



of London, Westminster, and their vicinity, the undersigned feel themselves bound to express, in the strongest terms, their marked disapprobation of an attempt, in their estimation so reckless and so improper; and the more so, considering the acknowledged powerful and happy influence the said General Body has had for upwards of a hundred years, in sustaining and extending throughout this whole kingdom, correct notions of civil and religious liberty, besides the beneficent remonstrances it has been honored, and not without success, to make in behalf of the right of private judgment on the great concerns of religion, and in aid of the oppressed in other counties of Europe.

"3dly. Because the members of the body who have carried this vote for separation, have evidently, and from their own showing, had recourse to this measure purely from their feelings as Arians or Unitarians, they alleging, as the reason of their doing so, their being aggrieved by the conduct towards them, on account of their doctrinal opinions, of the evangelical portion of the General Body of the Three Denominations. With such feelings the undersigned can have no sympathy, agreeing as they do, so far as the great doctrines of the Christian religion are concerned with the Congregational Body, and with that of the Particular or Anti-Pædo Baptists, and differing from them materially on the minor consideration of the form of church government, a difference which has been always recognized in the intercourse of the Three Denominations.—While the undersigned offer no opposition to Arians or Unitarians who view themselves aggrieved, seceding from the General Body, they cannot for one moment entertain the proposal of the withdrawalment of the Presbyterian body on any such account, or regard the attempt as otherwise than groundless and unjustifiable.

"4thly. The undersigned feel themselves bound to oppose the vote of separation, from the additional consideration that they, properly speaking, are the only Presbyterians of the body, those withdrawing being only so in name, besides their being, by the late decisions in the case of Lady Hewley's Charity, legally adjudged to be no Presbyterians, all that was Presbyterian of the body remains with its identity, unaffected by the circumstance of a majority of its members being in favor of the vote.

"5thly. On all these accounts the undersigned consider themselves as carrying with them all the privileges belonging to the Presbyterian Body, and as being and constituting the Presbyterian Denomination in the General Body of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of London and Westminster and their vicinity, and do, in consequence, claim the minutes of the Presbyterian Body.

WILLIAM BROADFOOT,  
JOHN YOUNG,  
ROBERT REDPATH.

*London, March 7, 1836."*

In the spirit of this Protest, they proceeded to appoint Mr. Broadfoot the Secretary of their Board—admitted to their number, the Rev. Mr. Archer, of Oxendon Chapel, and took measures to secure an early meeting of the General Body to consider the business.

On Wednesday, the 9th of March, an extraordinary general meeting of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations was accordingly held at the Library, Red Cross Street, "To receive a communication from certain members of the Presbyterian Board, respecting a resolution of the said Board to separate from the general Body."

The Rev. Joseph Fletcher, D. D. of Stepney, was called to the chair. We understand that the preceding documents were presented to the meeting, and ordered to be entered on the minutes—that the claim of the Orthodox Presbyterians to all the privileges of the Presbyterian Board was allowed, that a deputation was appointed to wait upon Lord John Russell, his Majesty's Secretary of State for the home Department, with a Memorial explanatory of the whole proceedings. That deputation\* consisted of Dr. Fletcher, the Chairman, the Rev. George Clayton, Secretary, and the Rev. Messrs. Broadfoot, Yates, Tidman, Binney, Steane, and Watts, who attended at the Home Office, on Thursday, March the 17th, but the result has not transpired.

From the Congregational Magazine for May.

*Annual Meeting of the General Body of Dissenting Ministers.*

On Tuesday morning, April 12th, the annual meeting of the Ministers of the three Denominations was held at the Library, Red Cross Street; the Rev. F. A. Cox, D. D. L. L. D. in the chair.

The Rev. George Clayton, of Walworth, was re-elected Secretary for the ensuing year; and after the other routine business was transacted, the Committee, appointed for that purpose, presented the draught of a statement to the public, in reply to "The reasons for withdrawal from the General Body," published by certain members of the Presbyterian Body. The further consideration of it was, however, adjourned to Monday, April 18th, when, with some verbal alterations, it was unanimously adopted.

*Statement of the Ministers of the Three Denominations.*

(1.) That from the passing of the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, till the demise of King William III., in 1702, the Protestant Nonconformist Ministers of the several denominations of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Anti-Pædobaptists, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, held occasional meetings of their respective denominations, for the purpose of presenting petitions and addresses to the throne on such matters as affected their rights as Protestant Ministers, or respected the general interests of civil and religious liberty.

(2.) That on the accession of Queen Anne, in 1702, the "three Denominations" for the first time united in an address to her Majesty, and since that period have been accustomed to hold united meetings. That in their collective capacity as "the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster," they have enjoyed the privilege of access to the throne in each successive reign to the present time, and of presenting addresses by deputation, as circumstances rendered expedient.

(3.) That some time after they had been recognised by the Government as a Body enjoying these privileges, the Ministers formed themselves into separate and distinct bodies, known respectively by the names of "The Presbyterian Body," "The Congregational Board," and "The Anti-Pædobaptist Board." That the first general meeting of the three Denominations, after the separate Bodies were organized, was held on the 11th day of July, 1727. That in these separate Bodies the Ministers of each Denomination have formed their own internal arrangements, and reported from time to time such Ministers as were added to their num-

\* This step became necessary, as the Seceding Unitarians had deputed Dr. Rees, Mr. Aspland, and Mr. Madge, to wait upon Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell upon the same subject.

ber, and had been "accepted and approved" in their several Denominations. Thus introduced to the General Body, they have severally continued members during life, unless they violated the standing laws of the Union; were officially notified as no longer members of the Body to which they respectively belonged; voluntarily withdrew from the Union; or were excluded by a vote of the General Body.

(4.) That the General Body in its collective capacity has never interfered with the proceedings of the respective and distinct bodies; its main object being the support and extension of civil and religious liberty—more especially in relation to the interests of Protestant Dissenters. That it, therefore, never took cognizance of the theological opinions of its members; such matters being left to the inquiry and decision of the separate Bodies.

(5.) That, nevertheless, it has been for many years the conviction of a great majority of the members of the General Body, that important changes had taken place in the doctrinal principles of "the Presbyterian Body;" many of its ministers having become, by their own professions, "Unitarians," and entertaining opinions essentially different from those of the Presbyterian Body, at the commencement of the General Union. That some also of the "General Baptist Body," reported as belonging to the Anti-Pædobaptist Denomination were of the same religious opinions with the Unitarian members of the Presbyterian Body.

(6.) That whatever might be the sentiments of the great majority of the General Body respecting this departure from the principles of the early Presbyterians on the part of such as are called Unitarians, no proceedings of the General Body have ever interfered with the "independence, rights, and privileges" of any of the separate bodies. That the General Body is not therefore responsible for such proceedings as have recently been adopted by any parties who may have called in question the moral right of Unitarians to be termed Presbyterians; or have employed legal measures in relation to any charitable trusts which may have been affected by the denial of that right; and that whatever may be the opinions of individual members on these subjects, the proceedings of the General Body have never, by its acts and resolutions, violated a single principle of its original constitution.

(7.) That in the annual election to the secretaryship of the General Body in 1835, the late Secretary received the grateful and unanimous thanks of the meeting for the ability with which he had discharged his official duties. That, nevertheless, it was deemed expedient to confer that appointment on a minister of one of the other denominations; because the appointment of members of the Presbyterian Body for a long series of years to that office was not consistent with the principle of rotation by which other appointments were regulated; because the relative position of the Presbyterian Body to the General Union had been materially changed, since, for many years after the formation of the Union, the members of the Presbyterian body had been the most numerous of the respective bodies, and on that account the Secretary had been generally elected from that denomination; while at the present time, and for a long period, they had not constituted one-seventh of the General Body; and because it was deemed expedient that the office of the secretaryship, being the only standing appointment, should at the present period be filled by one whose sentiments might be regarded as in more entire

accordance with those of the General Body of the Dissenting Ministers.\*

(8.) That as the General Body had never interfered with the proceedings of the separate Boards, it acted in perfect accordance with the principle and object of its constitution, in not interfering with the recent decision of the Anti-Pædobaptist Board, in declining to report in future as "accepted and approved Ministers," such as were of Unitarian principles belonging to the Baptist denomination.

(9.) That the recent withdrawal of certain Unitarian members of the Presbyterian Body from the General Union had not affected, and does not affect, the existence, constitution, and objects of the Union.—That those members who are in every respect Presbyterians, and have been for many years members of the General Body, still continue to sustain that relation; that their protest against the secession of the Presbyterian Body, and the reasons alleged in support of their continued connexion with the Union, have been cordially approved by the General Body; that the Union of the Ministers of the "Three Denominations" is thus inviolably preserved; and that the representations given to his Majesty's Government and the public, of the Union being dissolved, because certain Ministers of Unitarian principles have withdrawn from a body still consisting of more than one hundred and forty Ministers, are contrary to fact, and adapted to produce unwarranted and unjust impressions.

(10.) That the imputations contained in the alleged "reasons for withdrawal by the seceding ministers," reflecting on the General Body, as if any of its members were desirous of depriving them of their civil rights, or of "reviving the operation of penal statutes," are not accordant with fact, and unworthy the character of any party professing to regard the dictates of truth, justice, and charity.

F. A. COX, D. D., LL. D., Chairman.  
G. CLAYTON, Secretary.

From the Congregational Magazine for June.

*Further proceedings of the Unitarian Seceders from the three denominations.*

At an extraordinary meeting of the body of Presbyterian ministers residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, specially convened to take into consideration certain resolutions, relating to the withdrawal of the Presbyterian body, purporting to have been passed by the General Body of the Three Denominations, held by adjournment at Dr. Williams' Library, Red Cross street, on May 2, 1836.

The Rev. Robert Apsland, in the chair.

(1.) It was resolved unanimously—that this body of Presbyterian ministers, residing in and about the cities of London and Westminster, by its constitution entire and independent, and entitled and empowered to determine its own measures, at a special meeting held 4th of March, 1836, did, by a deliberate vote, passed agreeably to the forms and usages which have been observed by the body from the period of its incorpora-

\* It is but just to acknowledge, that while these several reasons were urged by various members of the General Body, in support of the amendment which substituted the name of Mr. Clayton for that of Dr. Rees, as Secretary for the ensuing year, Messrs. Price and Blackburn, who moved and seconded that amendment, assigned as the reason for the change they proposed, the Unitarian opinions of Dr. Rees; and though it is impossible to prove that this is the prevalent reason, yet many circumstances might be alleged to justify that assertion.—*Editor of Cong. Mag.*



tion, withdraw itself from the two other bodies of Congregational and Anti-Pædobaptist ministers; and that the resolutions declaring and affecting this withdrawal, were officially communicated to the respective secretaries of the two other bodies, and were, in various ways laid before the public; and that therefore, we have seen with a stronger feeling than surprise, that those two bodies have associated with themselves three dissentients from the resolutions of this body, who are members of the Scottish Secession Church, and connected in discipline with an ecclesiastical synod in Scotland, and were never considered as English Presbyterians but by courtesy, and pronouncing these individuals to be the Presbyterian body, have assumed that the two bodies aforesaid, with the individuals above described, constitute "The General body of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenting Ministers," and under this character have issued a series of resolutions, bearing the date of April 18, 1836, relating to our withdrawal.

(2.) That while we do not dispute the right of the Congregational and Anti-Pædobaptist bodies to unite with one another, and to add to their united body any individuals whom they choose, and to denominate such union by any name or title which shall truly designate it, we feel ourselves bound, by a regard to our rights and privileges to resist and expose an attempt to extinguish this body, and to put in its place three individuals who, in strictness of speech are not English Protestant Dissenting Ministers; and that we do again declare in the face of the world, that the union of the three denominations of Protestant dissenting ministers is dissolved from the period of our withdrawal.

(3.) That we adhere to the former resolutions of the date of the 4th of March, which we are fully prepared to substantiate and defend. That having carefully examined the resolutions of the two denominations and others, we do not hesitate to pronounce, that in so far as they purport to be an answer to the resolutions of this body, they are irrelevant, inconsistent and evasive—that they are besides historically incorrect; and farther, that they completely justify the charge preferred by this body, of the violation, on the part of the majority of the General Body, of the first principles of the late Union, viz. that the theological opinions of the separate bodies and their individual members should never be called in question or brought into discussion—inasmuch as they assert that "the great majority" were "for many years," watchful as to the "doctrinal principles" of the minority,—as they admit, although cautiously, that the new election of the late secretary was owing to the religious sentiments not being in accordance with those of the majority,—as they declare cordial approbation of the protest of the three individuals dissenting from the resolutions of this body, amongst which reasons is an appeal to a late decision in a court of law, supposed (as we believe very erroneously) to adjudge the English Presbyterians to be "no Presbyterians," on account of their religious faith,—and moreover, as they uniformly studiously designate this body by a merely doctrinal term, which term is not and never was assumed by the body, and could not have been used in the General Body, except in breach of order, and is not a fair representation of this body in its collective capacity, since whatever may be the theological sentiments of individual members, into which no inquiry is allowed, all ministers otherwise duly qualified, are admitted into the body, who hold the fundamental Protestant Dissenting principle, (the fundamental principle at least, of the English Presbyterians from the time they were recognized by law,) of the right of the free and unlimited ex-

ercise of private judgment in matters of religion, together with the corresponding right to full christian communion on the acknowledgment of the divine mission of our Lord, and of subjection to his authority as the head of his church.

(4.) That we are willing to give credit to the declaration of the two denominations; disclaiming for themselves as bodies, the purpose or wish to revive and put in force the penal statutes against any of their dissenting brethren; and that we leave it to the individuals in those bodies who have taken part in or expressed approbation of the recent legal proceedings against some of the English Presbyterians, to vindicate their consistency in making such use, or seeing, without remonstrance, such use made, of the penal statutes as tends to deprive the English Presbyterians of trusts committed to their hands from their foundation, and of ecclesiastical endowments established by and inherited from their fathers.

(5.) That in this trying exigency, we have been encouraged and confirmed in our deliberate and conscientious determination of withdrawal by the sympathy of our lay brethren, the English Presbyterian deputies of the metropolis, as declared in their recently published resolutions, and also by the general assurance of the approbation and concurrence of the English Presbyterians, both ministers and laymen, throughout the country.

(6.) That it be referred to a committee, now to be appointed, to draw up and publish without delay, a statement in justification of such of the foregoing resolutions as relate to the resolutions of the two denominations, and the individuals associated with them.

THOMAS REES,

Secretary.

#### ART. VII. *Religious Intelligence.*

CHINA.—We copy the following from the London Evangelical Magazine just received.—*Ch. Int.*

"CHINA OPENED," AND IN WHAT SENSE?—By SAMUEL DYER, a Missionary, eight years resident at one of the posts of observation.

To the Editor of the *Evangelical Magazine*.

DEAR SIR,—I should not presume to intrude myself upon your notice, and upon that of your readers, but from the impression upon my mind that British Christians to a very considerable extent, entertain erroneous views relative to the present aspect of China in relation to the missionary plans and operations. The prospect is, indeed, very bright and very glorious; but as yet we see it principally with the eyes of faith. Certain items of the prospect have, however, been of late more clearly developed: and with diffidence I offer the result of my observations upon these items respectively.

I ought, perhaps, first to account for a difference of opinion grounded upon the same facts, seeing that my observations differ from those which have of late been given to the public. We all know that there are some hearts which always burn, which are constantly in a flame,—full of holy love and holy zeal in the service of their blessed master; and they are highly privileged men, and men whose shoes we are not worthy to bear. And we want such men, to brave the dangers which we are too

timid to encounter. Their portion of the work is the most honorable to perform, and they are thrice blessed in their happy zeal. But then such men see with eyes peculiar to themselves; and, in sketching out a plan of operation, they will sketch a plan which none but themselves can execute,—yea, in their fiery ardor they will sketch a plan which even they cannot execute; only they have this advantage over us, that they remain undaunted, even though their plans should fail. I proceed to notice—

In my humble judgment there are some senses in which China is not yet open.

1. China is not generally opened to the reception of missionaries.—We need go no farther in proof of this assertion than the journals of very recent expeditions into the interior of China. It was most evident, on these occasions, that those who composed the expedition were watched with extreme jealousy; and on one occasion a party in a boat were fired on from both shores of a river, and driven back without being permitted to attain their object. It is true that the common people manifested no opposition to the strangers; but then, as soon as the authorities interfered, the common people slunk away in much timidity. But here is the point; as long as the authorities in China are so extremely jealous, however favorable the common people may be to the strangers, it is quite impossible for them to settle down among them. It would appear indeed, from some of the voyages along the eastern coast, that in some places perhaps a missionary might settle down for a month, or even two; but this is vastly different from what the case would be on the supposition that China were open to the reception of missionaries. If China were thus open, there are men upon the borders of the empire who would locate themselves within the walls of the city at the very first signal—yea, and even at the hazard of their lives, for “they love not their lives to the death.”

2. China is not yet open to the establishment of Christian schools; and,

3. China is not open to the printing of the scriptures and tracts in the interior. These follow of necessity from the first position; but with respect to this last there is this additional idea, that at Canton there were some moveable types (the character being cut upon the face of the metal,) which were cut for the use of the late lamented Dr. Morrison; and when I enquired for a few of them as specimens, I could not procure them, for they had been melted up during the late disturbances. However, it should be remembered that this was at Canton, where opposition is the strongest.

4. We want something more than bare assertion to prove the point in question; we want *one* missionary to *settle*, and having settled, and having made suitable attempts to publish the gospel to the people, let him write to us, and invite us to join him; and woe be to us if we refuse to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty!

II. There are other senses in which China is open. And here I would observe, that never was the prospect more bright, more glorious, than at this present day.

1. We can pour as many books into China as we can print. I speak not now of the Chinese colonies in the Archipelago, which would consume vastly more books annually than we can at present print; but into China Proper we can pour books by myriads. The trading expeditions to the eastward afford opportunities which we have seldom or never had

till most recently. Tracts and books are torn away from the distributors before they have time to open their packages. The avidity for our books is most striking; and, instead of one or two or three presses, we want a score, before we need have many books in store for lack of readers. If true, it is a most interesting fact, that Bhuddism spread over China by means of books, and books too that had no promise of a divine blessing to accompany the reading of them.

2. Never were our books better adapted to accomplish the desired end than at present. Leang Afa's tracts, at least many of them, are *beautifully simple*; the later tracts from the pen of the missionary at Batavia are most readily understood by the people. The Harmony of the Four Gospels, from the same pen, is most desirable. The revision of the Chinese Scriptures is going on under the most favorable auspices. Gospel truth is thus brought into more immediate contact with the Chinese mind than has ever been the case before. I do not mean barely to assert these things. I do not merely pass my own judgment; I appeal to the illiterate and uneducated Chinese—the poor emigrants from China; they point to certain books as most easily understood, and these are the very books we are now speaking of. I appeal to the well-educated and well-informed. I appeal to the Chinese classics themselves. Never were our books more idiomatic than at present.

3. The means of multiplying these books are rapidly increasing. Although I must needs speak with great diffidence on this head, I may state that beside the xylographic presses now in operation for China, typographic presses are preparing for four different missionary stations, and that when the preparatory work is accomplished, which makes progress from day to day, in eight months, and for £100, we can put any typographic press in operation in behalf of China; whereas the outlay for the first edition of 2000 copies of the Scriptures from a set of new blocks (blocks included) is nearly £2000.

Hoping that these brief remarks may assist, in some measure, in forming a just estimate for the present openings of usefulness in respect of China.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

Straits of Malacca, Nov. 1835,

S. D.

ROMANISM IN FRANCE.—It would be an erroneous opinion to suppose that the Catholic influence in France is either small or rapidly diminishing. Far from it. The overwhelming mass of this nation is Roman Catholic without doubt. It is true, however, that a large portion of the French Catholics are liberal and tolerant. It is also true, that there is an increase of Catholicism in France within the last two or three years.

And here I may remark, that the history of the Catholic religion in France, during the last century, or century and a half, is truly remarkable. When, through a long struggle, the Catholics had put down the Protestants, and monopolized every thing about the government, they carried matters to such a pitch that enlightened men of the world became infidels, and by their writings Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, and Rosseau, and their associates, succeeded in exposing the corruptions and oppressions of the Catholic church to contempt. The result was, the general prevalence of infidelity in France, and revolution of 1789-94, with all its horrors, and the destruction of the monarchy and



the church. Then succeeded, during the republic and the reign of Napoleon, a period of twenty years, in which the Catholic religion had but little influence upon the state and government. Its operation was quiet, unostentatious, and humble, and consequently few attempts were made to further propagate infidelity. And it is a remarkable fact, that few infidel works were published during that period. Very few editions of Voltaire's and Jean Jacques Rousseau's works were published during this period of twenty years.

But when the restoration took place, and Louis XVIII. came to the throne, succeeded by his brother Charles X., then came back the Catholic religion, not strictly speaking as to its existence (for it had been re-established nearly twenty years, by the influence of Bonaparte,) but in its former power, its superstitions, its external processions, its crucifixes in the streets, and its persecuting spirit. The court was ruled by the priesthood, and it seemed as if in a few years the country had gone back almost a century into ignorance and persecution. And what was the consequence of all this! The press began to teem again with attacks made upon Christianity, or, in other words, upon the Catholic religion, which was considered the same thing. New and large editions of the worst of Voltaire's and J. J. Rousseau's works were called for and circulated all over France; and the grand battle was fought between bigotry and infidelity, in which tyranny and liberty were also enlisted. The result was, that liberty and infidelity triumphed. Perfect toleration of religious opinion was to a good degree secured, and for a time the Catholic religion received a severe blow. Many thought it was a death blow; but it was not so. It was soon found that there was need of religion to sustain good order. All good and prudent men have seen and felt this. They have feared the re-enacting of the scenes of the first revolution. The consequence has been, for the last three years especially, an increasing return of the people to the Catholic church. This has simply been owing to the fact, that they have not known whither else to go. It is true, indeed, that evangelical religion has made much progress; but the laborers have been too few to make a sensible impression on the masses of people in this nation. And this is now the simple state of the case. Catholicism is increasing; but it is only the return of many who were for a time carried away from it by the political principles of the late revolution. It is nothing more than that.

It may be interesting to your readers to see a statement of the appropriations from the treasury for the maintenance of religion for the year 1837. It is as follows:

1. *For Catholic Worship.*

14 archbishops, including two cardinals,	240,000 fr.
66 bishops,	660,000
174 vicars-general	365,000
660 canons (attached to cathedrals)	1,003,500
3,301 cures,	4,190,100
20,705 parish priests,	20,900,000
5,419 vicars,	1,896,650
2,525 bourses (scholarships) at 400 frs. each,	1,019,000
<hr/>	
Total, 20,426 priests, &c.	34,276,600 frs.
	or \$6,389,362 50

## 2. For Protestant Worship.

For the support of 366 pastors of the Reformed Church, and 230 of the Augsburg Confession (Lutheran), in all 595,890 frs., or \$166,875.

In this sum is included 30 bourses (scholarships or bourses) of 400 frs. each, and 60 demi-bourses, at 200 frs. each, for the education of young men for the ministry.

Although the amount given to support the Catholic worship appears considerable, yet it is not one fourth part of what was given for the same object before the revolution of 1789.

CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF SCOTLAND.—This body met in Edinburgh on the 4th of May. We find a brief account of their proceedings in the London Congregational Magazine for June. Mr. Scales, a delegate who attended from the sister body in England, in a letter to the editor of that work, says "In the evening of the day of meeting, a *soiree* of the friends of the Union was held in the assembly room. Mr. W. L. Alexander, pastor of the church in Argyle Square Chapel, presided, and above eight hundred persons were present; the spectacle was altogether brilliant and imposing, and the proceedings of the evening were of a most pleasing character; there was a sober cheerfulness, a high state of feeling, joyous and exhilarating at times, yet rational, sacred, and spiritual throughout. There were no formal resolutions. Mr. Ewing spoke of the origin and progress of Congregationalism in Scotland; Mr. Cornwall, on Revivals of Religion; Dr. Russell, on Christian Love and Unity; Mr. M'Ray, on Slavery in America, a subject which is now exciting much attention in this country, and about which our brethren appear to feel very strongly. Near the close of the meeting Mr. George Thompson came in from Glasgow, and was enthusiastically received. He addressed the meeting with powerful interest on the state of American slavery."

From a report of the proceedings of the body in the Edinburgh Patriot, we learn that the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, proposed a series of resolutions on the subject of American Slavery, which were seconded by Dr. Russell, supported by Mr. George Thompson, and unanimously adopted. We have not room for them this week. We may perhaps insert them, with some comments, hereafter. We fear that the efforts of our good brethren in Scotland, though no doubt well intended, will rather injure than promote the cause they have so much at heart. They must not take their representations of the state of things in this country from such men as Mr. Thompson.—*N. Y. Ch. Obs.*

SCOTCH BAPTISTS.—An article in the London Baptist Magazine, presents but a melancholy picture of the present state of the Baptists in Scotland, so far as regards christian union. It appears that there are two classes of them, known by the name of Scotch and English Baptists. The English Baptists are the same in their government and discipline as the churches of that denomination in England, with this difference, that in general they partake of the Lord's Supper every Sabbath instead of once a month. The Scotch Baptists are somewhat different, contending for a plurality of elders, mutual exhortation by the brethren on the Lord's day, and disapproving of pastoral support, &c.; but so miserably divided are they, not only from each other, but among themselves, that the remark has become almost proverbial in

Scotland: "The Baptists are a mere rope of sand." The writer, himself a Baptist, while lamenting this state of things, admits that the facts are undeniable. "They are facts too notorious to admit of contradiction; for it may with safety be affirmed that there is not a denomination of christians in all Scotland, Presbyterian, Relief, Secession, or Independent, but what has got the start of the Baptists so far as Scriptural union is concerned." S.

**CONVERTS FROM POPERY IN IRELAND.**—We learn from a late minister of the Dublin Record, that one of the most highly esteemed priests of the Roman Communion in that city, recently sought an interview with a clergyman of the Established Church, avowed to him his conviction of the errors of the church of Rome, and expressed his determination to withdraw from her communion. The Record adds:

Amongst the laity a considerable movement is also perceptible, and several highly respectable persons have recently left the mystical Babylon, we trust never to return under its galling yoke. Not many days since, Mrs. Edwards, a Roman Catholic lady, requested her confessor, the Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, to appoint a day, when he would, according to his repeated promises, remove some very distressing doubts which had arisen in her mind. The Reverend Gentleman accordingly waited upon her at her house. The lady had so arranged matters that two Protestants, one of whom had formerly been a Romish priest, but is now, we firmly believe, a faithful servant of the Lord (we allude to the Rev Mr. Nolan) should be present at the interview between her and her former spiritual adviser. The objections were stated, but were not answered to the lady's satisfaction. Her understanding as well as her conscience had been awakened; and the sophistry which previously had been adequate to keep her in the regions of spiritual darkness, now proved totally unavailing. The Protestant gentleman propounded several questions to the priest, which he felt himself quite unable to answer. He became manifestly uncomfortable, and made several attempts to quit the apartment with as good a grace as possible. The lady and her other visitors, however, contrived to detain him; and the controversy was carried on with vigor, until his Reverence virtually struck his colors, and the lady declared herself fully persuaded that she had previously been the victim of a system of delusion which she was resolved from that hour to repudiate. An authentic account of the particulars of Mrs. Edward's reformation has just appeared, we have been told, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Nolan himself. We also expect to be able, in a few days, to announce the conversion of another Roman Catholic clergyman of this city, with regard to whom, circumstances prevent us from being more explicit at present.

A previous number of the Record had contained the following announcement.

A Roman Catholic priest, named Swaine, hitherto engaged as an officiating clergyman in the Carmelite chapel, adjoining York-row, has abandoned the Romish persuasion. For some time past it appears that his mind was seriously affected with doubt as to the purity of the religion in which he was educated. Having determined to renounce the Church of Rome, his intention was communicated to a superior priest, whose conscience was in perfect peace on the question of religion. This confidant, we are informed, offered Mr. Swaine a considerable sum of money, if he would give up his intention, and apply personally at the

Court of Rome for absolution. However, the plan did not succeed, and Mr. Swaine is now on his way to America, with letters of recommendation from one of the dignitaries of the Established Church.

#### ART. VIII. *Miscellany.*

**RELAXED VIEWS OF TRUTH.**—The editor of the *Charleston Observer*, in an apology for the rigidly Orthodox, refers to the unhappy effects on truth produced by the vain attempt of the great Baxter to cement a union between truth and error, and quotes the following paragraphs from "*Orme's Life of Baxter*."—*Presbyterian*.

"In illustration of the influence now adverted to, it must be remarked, that the first stage in the process of deterioration which took place among the Presbyterian Dissenters, was generally characterized by the term Baxterianism; a word to which it is difficult to attach a definite meaning. It describes no separate sect or party, but rather a system of opinions on doctrinal points, verging towards Arminianism, and which ultimately passed to Arianism and Socinianism. Even during Baxter's own life, while the Presbyterians taxed the Independents with Antinomianism, the latter retorted the charge of Socinianism, or at least with a tendency towards it, in some of the opinions maintained both by Baxter and others of that party. To whatever cause it is to be attributed, it is a melancholy fact, that the declension which began even at this early period in the Presbyterian body, went on slowly, but surely, till from the most fervid orthodoxy, it finally arrived in England, at the frigid zone of Unitarianism."

"I wish not to be understood as stating that Baxter either held any opinions of this description, or was conscious of a tendency in his sentiments towards such a fearful consummation, but that there was an injurious tendency to his manner of discussing certain important subjects. It was subtle, and full of logomachy; it tended to unsettle, rather than to fix and determine; it gendered strife rather than godly edifying. It is not possible to study such books as his *Methodus*, and his *Catholic Theology*, without experiencing that we are brought into a different region from apostolic Christianity; a region of fierce debate and altercation about words, and names, and opinions; in which all that can be said for error is largely dwelt upon, as well as what can be said of truth. The ambiguities of language, the divisions of sects; the uncertainties of human perception and argument, are urged, till the force of revealed truth is considerably weakened, and confidence in our own judgment of its meaning greatly impaired. Erroneous language is maintained to be capable of sound meaning, and the most Scriptural phrases to be capable of unscriptural interpretation, till truth and error almost change places, and the mind is bewildered, confounded, and paralyzed. In this mode of discussing such subjects, was this most excellent man led, partly by the natural constitution of his mind, which has often been adverted to; partly by his ardent desire of putting an end to the divisions of the Christian world, and producing universal concord and harmony. He failed where success was impossible, however plausible might have been the means which he employed. He understood the causes of difference and contention better than their remedies; hence the measures which he used frequently aggravated instead of curing the disease."

**BRITISH IDOLATRY.**—This title, to the extract which we give below,



from the letter of a correspondent of the London Record residing in India, is far more correct and proper than that of "American slavery," to the articles which under this head are now circulating in English Magazines and newspapers. It has long been the disgrace of the British government, that her Protestant soldiers are compelled, even on the holy Sabbath, to aid in the mumeries and idolatrous ceremonies of Papiests and Mahometans. We are happy to find that the good people are at last beginning to awake to the importance of cleansing themselves from this sin. Mr. Plumptre has given notice of his intention to introduce a motion on the subject at the present session of the British parliament.—*N. Y. Ch. Observer.*

"You are probably aware that both by His Majesty's regulations and by the articles of war, the European troops are required to attend divine service at their respective places of worship on the morning of the Lord's day. Yet in direct opposition to this praiseworthy regulation, and more than this, in daring violation of the Divine command, the whole of the European artillery were kept from church, and employed the greater part of one of the Sabbath days in Lent, in firing a series of salutes in honor of a Mahomedan festival! I will only add, that I am credibly informed that this subject was made the ground of a presentment to the ordinary, and a representation to the Government, of which no notice whatever has, up to this time, been taken, or, as far as I have been able to ascertain, any means adopted to prevent a repetition of so extraordinary a desecration of that day, which is specially appointed to be kept holy, as being the Sabbath of the Lord our God. It is quite unnecessary that I should stop to remark on the dishonour thus done to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or the encouragement and triumph (so injurious to missionary exertions) afforded to the false prophet. I pass on to inform you secondly, that the band of one of His Majesty's regiments, consisting with one exception, of Protestants, members of the Church of England, and six of them pious men and communicants, were at a later period compelled on two occasions, to attend the Roman Catholic chapel, taking part in the service, and especially in that part of it where the host is elevated. Both times the men were plentifully supplied with liquor by the priest, at whose house they played for some hours, and who drank with them, and they were marched back to their barracks, several of them in a state of intoxication, on the Lord's day, two or three hours only before the holy communion was administered, in which several of them were to join.

"Many of your readers will wonder how this should be, when his Majesty's regulations so distinctly forbid a Roman Catholic soldier being ordered to attend a Protestant place of worship. They will naturally argue that, by parity of reason, the Protestant's conscientious scruples should be respected, particularly when he is a member of that pure and Apostolical Church which publicly and justly denounces the sacrifice of the mass as a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit;' but in this they give proof of their honest simplicity! They need but to visit our colonies, and especially this of India, to know that the Protestant's conscience is the last thing considered.

"The religious scruples either of the Mahomedan or of the Heathen, or Christian idolater, are accounted sacred, and even applauded, but not so those of the Protestant, though they are based upon the Word of God, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

**THE GENEVA PRESBYTERY ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.**—The following article has been put into our hands, with a request that we would publish it. It gives us an additional exemplification of what has been too frequent in the church, the gradual introduction and increase of vain or superstitious rites. *Paulatim*—little by little, is the way in which all errors and extravagances and superstitions obtain prevalence in the church. We confess we were scarcely prepared for a solemn presbyterial *recommendation* of the use of instrumental music in the churches in all cases where it is possible.—*Ch. Magazine*.

The following question came up for advice, from the session of the church in Waterloo, viz: Is the use of instrumental music in divine worship consistent with Presbyterianism?

Whereupon, the question was put to all the members of the presbytery, and unanimously answered that instrumental music in divine worship is consistent with Presbyterianism and the gospel; and that they not only highly approve of the same, but would also recommend to all the churches under their care, where it can be done, to secure the aid of such music in the public praise of the sanctuary.—*Extract from Minutes*.

**WM. WIRT AND POLITICS.**—In the Memoirs of the Rev. Dr. Rice, just issued from the press, we find a letter from the late excellent and amiable Wm. Wirt, in which he thus amusingly expresses his unfitness for political life. 'I am sick of public life; my skin is too thin for the business; a politician should have the hide of a rhinoceros to bear the thrusts of the folly, ignorance and meanness of those who are disposed to mount into momentary consequence by questioning *their betters*,—if I may be excused the expression after professing my modesty. 'There's naught but care on every hand;' all, all is vanity and vexation of spirit, save religion, friendship and literature.'

**CLAUSE IN AN ANTIEN LEASE.**—"Our respected friend, Gen-Stephen Van Rensselaer," says the Christian Intelligencer, "has shown us a clause in an ancient lease given by one of his ancestors. This lease was given at the first ettlement in that district of country, when for a length of time the want of a regular ministry was expected to exist. We copy the clause not only as curious in itself, but also as showing the care of our forefathers in promoting religious observances, and the order of their own church in their earliest settlements.

1651. A LEASE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF RENSSELAERWICK FOR THE OLD MAIZE LAND AT CATTSKILL.

*The tenant to read a sermon or portions of the Scriptures every Sunday, and high festival, to the Christians in the neighborhood, and sing one or more psalms before, and after prayers, agreeable to the custom of the church of Holland.*

**ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.**—The Associate Presbytery of Albany, on the 24th ult. ordained to the office of the holy ministry Mr. Hugh H. Blair, and installed him in the pastoral charge of the 2nd Associate Congregation in the city of New-York. Sermon by the Rev. John G. Smart—Charges by the Rev. James Martin.

The same Presbytery, at a meeting held in Albany on the 20th of July, licensed Mr. Chauncey Webster to preach the everlasting gospel.

ol-  
we  
as  
use  
in  
ce  
nn  
he  
  
he  
ne  
  
py-  
or-  
ey  
all  
aid  
om

ce,  
nd  
ess  
he  
he  
os-  
rs,  
ty.  
ka-

en-  
wn  
his  
for  
st.  
he  
or-

HE

n-  
ne  
he

on  
H.  
n-  
rt

y,

i

## CONTENTS.

	page.		page.
ART. I. Review of an account of the Secession from the established Church of Scotland,.....	145	Romanism in France,.....	186
ART. II. Remarks on the ancient mode of singing Psalms,.....	162	Congregational Union of Scotland,.....	188
ART. III. Brief Expositions of Important Texts,.....	162	Scotch Baptists,.....	"
ART. IV. The Christian World Unmasked,.....	167	Converts from Popery in Ireland,.....	189
ART. V. Decrease of Population in Heathen Nations,.....	173	ART. VIII. Miscellany,.....	190
ART. VI. English Unitarians,.....	175	Relaxed Views of Truth,.....	"
ART. VII. Religious Intelligence,.....	184	British Idolatry,.....	"
China,.....	"	The Geneva Presbytery on Instrumental Music,.....	192
		William Wirt and Politics,.....	"
		Clause in an Antient Lease,.....	"
		Ecclesiastical Record,.....	"

## Notice to Subscribers.

Having received a greater number of subscribers than was anticipated at the time the second number of the present volume was put to press, we find that we are unable to supply several late subscribers with Nos. 2 and 3. No. 1 will be sent to them along with the present number. And by next month we trust we shall be able to send them the *deficient* numbers, as we intend to reprint them as soon as practicable. As this will put us to considerable additional expense, we hope new subscribers enough will be obtained to take up the surplus copies, which will remain after the present subscribers shall have been supplied.

## AGENTS.

ALL MINISTERS AND PREACHERS OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate Church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

John Robertson, Cambridge, Washington Co., N. Y. A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y. G. A. Martin, Pittsburgh, Pa. Alex. Gailey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co., Pa. Wm. McMillan, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa. John Smith, Baltimore, Md. Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.	E. Lauderdale, York, Livingston Co. N. Y. Tho's Cummings, Putnam, Wash'n Co. N. Y. James Wilson, Esq., Fawn Grove, York Co. Pa. Alexander W. Browster, Erie, Pa. James Hutchinson, Esq., New London Cross Roads, Chester Co. Pa. John Smith, P. M., Pleasant Run, Carroll Co., Indiana. William S. Young, 173 Race-street, Philadelphia.
--	--

TERMS \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.